# Islam versus Ahl Al Kitab

## Past and Present

Maryam Jameelah

# ISLAM VERSUS AHL AL-KITAB PAST AND PRESENT

MARYAM JAMEELAH

TAJ COMPANY

*Publishers :*
**Taj Company**
**3151, Turkman Gate**
**DELHI-110006**

EDITION : 1993

PRICE : Rs. **80**

*Printed at :*
**Taj Printers**
Najafgarh Ind. Area,
NEW DELHI

# CONTENTS

## JEWS AND CHRISTIANS IN THE LIGHT OF QURAN AND HADITH

Those who believe in that which is revealed unto thee (Muhammad) and those who are Jews and Christians and Sabeans—whoever believeth in Allah and the Last Day and doeth right—surely their reward is with their Lord and there shall no fear come upon them; neither shall they grieve. II : 62.

Oh Children of Israel! Remember my favour with which I favoured you and how I preferred you to all creation. And guard yourselves against a day when no soul in aught will avail another nor will compensation be accepted from it nor will intercession be of use to it nor will they be helped. II : 122-123

And they say: None entereth Paradise unless he be a Jew or a Christian. These are their own desire. Say : Bring forth your proof of what ye state if ye are truthful! II : 111.

And the Jews will not be pleased with thee nor will the Christians till thou follow their creed. Say, the guidance of Allah is the Guidance. And if thou shouldst follow their desires after the knowledge which hath come to thee, then wouldst thou have from Allah no protecting friend nor helper. II : 120

And the Jews say the Christians follow nothing true and the Christians say the Jews follow nothing true yet both are readers of the Scriptures. Even thus speak those we know not. Allah will judge between them on the Day of Resurrection concerning that wherein they differ. II : 113

And they say: Be Jews or Christians, then ye will be guided. Say unto them, (O Muhammad), Nay but we follow the religion of Abraham the Upright and he was not of the idolators. Say (O Muslims), we believe in Allah and that which is revealed unto us and that which was revealed unto Abraham, Ishmael, Isaac and Jacob and the tribes and that which Moses and Jesus received and that which all the prophets received from their Lord. We make no distinction between any of them and unto Him we have surrendered. II : 135-136.

Have ye (Muslims) any hope that they (the Jews) will be true to you when a party of them used to listen to the Word of Allah, then used to change it after they had understood it knowingly? II ; 75

Woe be unto those who write the Scripture with their hands and then say, 'This is from Allah,' that they may purchase a small gain therewith. Woe unto them for that their hands have written and woe unto them for that they earn thereby. II; 79

And because of their breaking the Covenant, We have cursed them (the Jews) and made hard their hearts. They change words from their contexts and forget a part whereof they were admonished. Thou wilt not cease to discover treachery from all save a few of them. But bear with them and pardon them—lo! Allah loveth the kindly. And with those who say, lo, we are Christians, We made a Covenant but they forgot a part of that whereof they were admonished. Therefore We have stirred up enmity and hatred among them (between the Jews and Christians) till the Day of Resurrection when Allah will inform them of their handiwork. V : 13-14.

The People of the Scripture ask of thee that thou shouldst cause an (actual) Book to descend upon them from Heaven. They asked a greater thing of Moses aforetime

for they said : Show us Allah plainly. The storm of lightning seized them for their wickedness. Then after that they chose the calf for worship after clear proofs of Allah's sovereignty had come to them. And We forgave them that! And We bestowed on Moses evident authority. And We caused the Mount (Sinai) to tower above them that at the taking of their Covenant and We bade them....Trangress not the Sabbath and We took from them a firm Covenant IV; 153-154

And remember when ye (children of Israel) said : O Moses, we are weary of one kind of food so call upon thy Lord for us that He bring forth for us of that which the earth grows—of its herbs, its cucumbers, its corn, lentils and onions. He said : Would you exchange that which is higher for that which is lower? Go down to settled country, thus ye shall get that which ye demand. And humilitation and wretchedness were stamped upon them (the Jews) and they were visited with wrath from Allah. That was because they disbelieved in Allah's revelations and slew the Prophets wrongfully. That was for their disobedience and transgression. II : 61

Because of the wrongdoing of the Jews, We forbade them good things which We (before) made lawful unto them and because of their much hindering from Allah's way and their taking usury when they were forbidden it and of their devouring wealth by false pretences. We have prepared for those who disbelieve a shameful doom! But those of them who are firm in knowledge and the believers in that which is revealed unto thee (Muhammad) and that which was revealed before thee, especially the diligent in prayer and those who pay the poor-due, the believers in Allah and the Last Day, upon these We shall bestow an immense reward. IV : 160-162

And thou wilt find them (the Jews) greediest of mankind for life and even greedier for it than the idolaters.

Each of them would like to be allowed to live a thousand years and to live a thousand years would by no means remove them from the Doom. Allah is seer of what they do. II : 96

We made a Covenant of old with the Children of Israel and we sent to them Messengers. As often as a messenger came unto them which their souls desired not, they grew rebellious. Some of them they denied and some they slew. They thought no harm would come of it so they were wilfully blind and deaf. And afterward Allah turned in mercy toward them. Now even after that many of them are wilfully blind and deaf. Allah is seer of what they do. V: 70-71

O People of the Scriptures! Why will ye argue about Abraham when the Torah and the Gospel were not revealed until after him? Have ye then no sense? II: 65

Abraham was not a Jew nor yet a Christian but he was an upright man who had surrendered unto Allah and he was not of the idolators. Lo! Those of mankind who have the best claim to Abraham are those who followed this Prophet and those who believe with him and Allah is the protecting Friend of the believers. III: 67-68

And lo! There is a party of them who distort the scriptures with their tongues that ye may think what they say is from the Scripture when it is not from the Scripture. And they say : It is from Allah when it is not from Allah and they speak a lie concerning Allah knowingly. III: 78

They have indeed disbelieved who say: Lo, Allah is the Messiah, the son of Mary. Say, Who then can do aught against Allah if He had willed to destroy the Messiah, son of Mary and his mother and everyone on earth? Allah's is the Sovereignity of the heavens and the earth and all that is between them and Allah is able to do all things. V : 17

They surely disbelieve who say: Lo, Allah is the Messiah, son of Mary. The Messiah himself said, O Children of Israel! Worship Allah, my Lord and your Lord. Lo! Whoso ascribeth partners unto Allah, forbidden for him is Paradise. His abode is the Fire. For evil-doers there will be no helpers.

Lo! The likeness of Jesus with Allah is as the likeness of Adam. He created him of dust and then He said unto him: Be! And he is! III : 59.

And when the angels said: Oh Mary! Lo, Allah hath chosen thee and made thee pure and hath preferred thee above all the women of creation. III : 42

And remember when the angels said: Oh Mary! Lo, Allah giveth thee glad tidings of a son from Him whose name is the Messiah, Jesus, son of Mary, illustrious in the world and the Hereafter and one of those brought near unto Allah. He will speak unto mankind in his cradle and in his manhood, he is of the righteous. She said: My Lord! how can I have a child when no mortal hath touched me? He said: So it will be. Al'ah createth what He will. If he decreeth a thing, He saith unto it only Be! And it is! And He will teach him the Scripture and wisdom and the Torah and the Gospel. And will make him a Messenger unto the Children of Israel saying: Lo! I come unto you with a sign from your Lord. Lo! I fashion for you out of clay the likeness of a bird and I breathe into it and it is a bird by Allah's leave. I heal him who was born blind and the leper and I raise the dead by Allah's permission. And I announce unto you what ye eat and what ye store up in your houses. Lo, verily it is a portent for you if ye are believers. And I come confirming that which was before me of the Torah and to make lawful some of that which was forbidden unto you. I come unto you with a sign from your Lord so keep your

duty to Allah and obey me. Lo Allah is my Lord and your Lord so worship Him. This is a straight path. III ; 45-51

And make mention of Mary in the Scripture when she had withdrawn from her people to a chamber looking East and hath chosen seclusion from them. Then We sent unto her Our spirit and it assumed for her the likeness of a perfect man. She said : Lo, I seek refuge in the Beneficent One from thee if thou art Godfearing. He said : I am only a messenger of thy Lord that I may bestow on thee a faultless son. She said : How can I have a son when no mortal hath touched me, neither have I been unchaste? He said, So it will be. Thy Lord saith, It is easy for Me. And it will be that We may make of him a revelation for mankind and a mercy from Us and it is a thing ordained. And she conceived and withdrew with him to a far place. And the pangs of childbirth drove her unto the trunk of a palm tree. She said, O would have I died ere this and become a thing of naught—forgotten! Then an angel cried out unto her from below her saying: Grieve not! Thy Lord hath placed a rivulet beneath thee and shake the trunk of the palm tree and ripe dates will fall upon thee. So eat, drink and be consoled. And if thou meetest any mortal say, Lo! I have vowed a fast unto the Beneficent and may not speak this day to any mortal. Then she brought him, carrying him to her own folk. They said, Oh Mary! Thou hast come with an amazing thing! Oh sister of Aaron, thy father was not a wicked man nor was thy mother a harlot. Then she pointed to him. They said, How can we speak to one who is in the cradle, a young boy? He spake, Lo! I am the slave of Allah. He hath given me Scripture and hath appointed me a Prophet. And hath enjoined upon me prayer and almsgiving so long as I remain alive. And hath made me dutiful towards her who bore me and hath not made me arrogant, unblest. Peace be on me the day I was born and the day I die and the day I shall be raised alive! Such was Jesus, son of Mary,

This is a statement of the truth concerning which they doubt. It befitteth not the Majesty of Allah that He should take unto Himself a son. Glory be to Him! When he decreeth a thing, He saith unto it only, Be and it is! And lo!, Allah is my Lord and your Lord, so serve Him. That is the right path. The sects among them (the Christians) differ but woe unto the disbelievers on the meeting of an awful Day! XIX : 16-37.

(As for) their saying: We (the Jews) slew the Messiah, the son of Mary, Allah's Messenger. They slew him not nor crucified him. It so appeared unto them and lo, those who disagree concerning it are in doubt thereof; they have no knowledge save in pursuit of a conjecture. They slew him not for certain but Allah took him up unto Himself. Allah is ever Mighty. Wise. There is not one of the Peoples of Scriptures but will believe in him (Jesus Christ) before his death and on the Day of Resurrection he will be a witness against them. IV : 157-159.

Nawas bin Siman reported that the Apostle of Allah mentioned about the *Dajjal* (anti-Christ) . . . Allah will send the Messiah, son of Mary . . . He (Christ) will then search for him (*Dajjal*) till he will overtake him at the door of Lud (in Palestine) and then he will kill him . . . (Muslim, Tirmizi)

Abu Hurairah reported that the Messenger of Allah said: The son of Mary will certainly descend as Ruler. He shall break the Cross, kill swines, establish *Jizya* and leave the young she-camels without riding them and mutual enmity, hatred and malice will certainly disappear. He shall call towards wealth but none will accept it . . . How will you be when the son of Mary will come down amongst you and your *Imam* (Mehdi) will come from among you? (Muslim)

Abdullah bin Amir reported that the Messenger of Allah said : Jesus, the son of Mary, will come down to the world

(again). He will marry and there will be his issue and he will live for forty-five years and then die. He will be buried in my grave. Then I and Jesus, son of Mary, will stand up (on Resurrection Day) in one grave between Abu Bakr and Umar. (Ibn ul Jauzi)

The Messiah, son of Mary, was no other than a Messenger, of the like of whom have passed away before him. And his mother (Mary) was a saintly woman. And they used to eat earthly food. See how We make the revelations clear for them and see how they are turned away? V : 73-75.

Thou wilt find the most vehement of mankind in hostility to those who believe to be the Jews and idolaters. And thou wilt find the nearest of them in affection to those who believe to be those who say : Lo, we are Christians. That is because there are among them priests and monks and because they are not proud. When they listen to that which hath been revealed unto the Messenger, thou seest their eyes overflow with tears because of their recognition of the truth. They say, Our Lord, we believe, Inscribe us among the witnesses. V .: 82-83.

Oh ye who believe! Choose not for friends such of those who received the Scripture before you and of the disbelievers to make a jest and sport of your faith but keep your duty to Allah if ye are true believers. V : 57.

Oh ye who believe!! Take not the Jews and Christians for friends. They are friends one to another. He among you who taketh them for friends is one of them. Lo, Allah guideth not wrongdoing folk. V : 51.

Jaber bin Abdullah reported: Umar Ibn Khattab informed me that he heard the Apostle of Allah say (during his last illness), I must expel the Jews and Christians from the

peninsula of Arabia. If I live, God willing, I must expel the Jews and Christians from the peninsula of Arabia.

(Muslim).

Jaber reported from the Holy Prophet when Umar came to him and said, Verily we hear traditions from the Jews which please us. Will you advise us to write down some of these? He said, Do you wish to court destruction as the Jews and Christians have courted? I have certainly brought Quran to you like a fresh egg. Had Moses been alive, he would not have preferred but to follow me.

(Musnad of Ahmad ibn Hanbal).

And thou seest many of them (Jews and Christians) vying one with another in sin and transgression and their devouring of illicit gain. Verily, evil is what they do. Why do not their rabbis and priests forbid their evil-speaking and their devouring of illicit gain? Verily evil is what they do.

V : 62-63.

Um Habibah and Um Salamah spoke of a church they had seen in Ethiopia in which there were statues and pictures of Jesus and the saints and they mentioned this to the Prophet. He said: Behold, those people when a righteous man from among them dies and builds over his grave a church and sets therein such-like images, on Resurrection Day, God will regard them as the most wicked of His creation. (Salih-al-Bukhari).

It is not possible for any human being unto whom Allah had given the Scripture and wisdom and the Prophethood that he should afterwards have said to mankind: Be slaves of me instead of Allah but what he said was: Be ye faithful servants of the Lord by virtue of your constant teaching of the Scripture and of your constant study thereof. III: 79.

Oh children of Israel! Remember My favour wherewith I favoured you and fulfill your part of the Convenant. I shall

fulfill My part of the Covenant and fear Me! And believe in that which I reveal confirming that which ye possess already of the Scripture and be not first to disbelieve therein and part not with My revelations for a trifling and keep your duty to Me! II; 40-41.

Oh people of the Scripture! Why disbelieve ye in the revelations of Allah when ye yourselves bear witness to their truth? Oh People of the Scripture! Why confound ye truth with falsehood and knowingly conceal the truth?
III: 70-71.

Say, Oh people of the Scripture, come to an agreement between us and you; that we shall worship none but Allah and that we shall ascribe no partner unto Him and that none of us shall take others for Lords besides Allah. And if they turn away, then say, bear witness that we are they who have surrendered unto Him. III: 64.

Say, Oh people of the Scripture! Why drive ye back believers from the way of Allah seeking to make it crooked when ye are witnesses to Allah's guidance? Allah is not unware of what ye do. III: 99.

And whoso seeketh a way of life other than Islam, it will not be accepted from him and he will be a loser in the Hereafter. III: 85.

If only the people of the Scripture would believe and ward off evil, surely We would remit their sins from them and surely bring them into Gardens of Delight. V: 65.

Seek they other than the faith of Allah when unto Him submitteth whatsoever is in the heavens and the earth, willingly or unwillingly and unto Him they will be returned.
III: 83.

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

## PREFACE

The subject of this book is the traditional religious legacy of the West, the impact of contemporary materialism upon Judaism and Christianity and how this modernist philosophy, through the political, economic, scientific and military supremacy of Europe and America, has affected the Muslims. This work is a thorough description and analysis of the Jewish and Christian mentality as illustrated by their history, their ideals, their leaders and their devotional practices. In order to understand the Jewish and Christian mind, extensive quotations from their own literature were essential. The conclusions are drawn from a study of Jewish and Christian books from the standpoint of Islamic teachings combined with the convictions resulting from my own personal experiences. Thus this work is partly autobiographical.

Jews and Christian share with Muslims a common religious and cultural heritage. In our past, present and future destiny we are linked together with indissoluable ties. Indeed, the ties that bind us are so potent that no Muslim can repudiate them without denying the historical foundations of his own faith. Tragically, however, our common legacy has never

been able to prevent the development of the most hostile feelings of enmity and strife. Although what divides us may be narrow, the gulf that separates us is so deep that as circumstances now stand, I fear it is unbridgeable. Our differences appear to be irreconcilable.

Even today when the Muslims have sunk into the most abysmal depths of degradation and decay, Islam still remains the most formidable potential rival to the modern West, boldly challenging all its hedonistic culture stands for. The Christian and Jewish Orientalists are fully aware of this fact. Hence the special departments in universities and seminaries scattered throughout Europe and America dedicated to understand Islam only to enable its enemies to destroy it. These "Islamic Institutes" and "Islamic Research Centres" are now busy establishing their satellites in one Muslim country after the other, the purpose of which is to subvert the Islamic cause from within and frustrate any attempts for genuine Islamic revival. This book is an effort to meet that challenge. In order to cope effectively with the menace that faces us now, other Muslim scholars must collaborate in the task and produce more works to follow.

MARYAM JAMEELAH

# HOW I DISCOVERED THE HOLY QURAN AND ITS IMPACT UPON MY LIFE

My discovery of Holy Quran was tortuous and led me through strange by-ways but since the end of the road was supremely worthwhile, I have never regretted my experiences.

As a small child I possessed a keen ear for music and was particularly fond of the classical operas and symphonies considered the high culture in the West. Music was my favourite subject in school in which I always earned the highest grades. By sheer chance, when I was about eleven years old, I happened to hear Arabic music over the radio which so much pleased me that I was determined to hear more. As soon as I heard Arabic music, Western music at once lost all its appeal for me. I would not leave my parents in peace until my father finally took me to the Syrian section in New York City where I brought a stack of Arabic recordings for my gramophone. The one I liked best was a rendition of the *Surah Maryam* of the Holy Quran chanted by Um Kulthum. Then in 1946, I could not forsee how famous she was to become in her later years; I admired her for her beautiful voice which rendered those passages of Holy Quran with such intense feeling and devotion. It was by listening to these recordings by the hour that I came to love the sound of Arabic even though I could not understand it. Without this basic appreciation of the Arabic musical idiom, which sounds so utterly strange

to the Westener, I could not possibly have grown to love *Tilawat.* My parents, relatives and neighbours thought Arabic and its music dreadfully weird and so distressing to their ears that whenever I put on my recordings, they demanded that I close all the doors and windows of my room lest they be disturbed! After I embraced Islam in 1961, I used to sit enthralled by the hour at the mosque in New York, listening to tape-recordings of *Tilawat* chanted by the celebrated Egyptian *Qari*, Abdul Basit. But one *Juma Salat*, the *Imam* did not play the tapes. We had a special guest—a short, very thin and poorly-dressed black youth who introduced himself to us as a student from Zanzibar; but when he opened his mouth to recite *Surah ar-Rahman*, I never heard such glorious *Tilawat* even from Abdul Basit! This obscure African adolescent possessed such a voice of gold, surely Hazrat Bilal must have sounded much like him!

From the age of ten I had developed a passion for reading all the books about the Arabs I could lay my hands on at school or at the public libraries in my community, especially those dealing with the historical relationship between the Jews and Arabs, but it was not until more than nine years later that it ever occurred to me to satisfy my curiosity about the Holy Quran. Gradually, however, as I neared the end of my adolescence, I became convinced that it was not the Arabs who had made Islam great but Islam which had raised the Arabs from wild desert tribes to the masters of the world. It was not until I wanted to find out just how and why this had happened that I ever thought to read the Holy Quran for myself.

In the summer of 1953 I overstrained myself at college by taking an accelerated course of too many subjects. That August I fell ill and had to discontinue all work for the remainder of the season. One evening when my mother was about to go to the public library, she asked me if there was any book I wanted. I asked her for a copy of Holy Quran. An hour later she returned with one—a translation by the eighteenth-century Christian missionary and scholar—George Sale. Because of the extremely archaic language and the copious footnotes quoting from al-Baidawi and Zamakhshari out of context in order to refute them from the Christian viewpoint, I understood very little. At that time, my immature mind regarded Quran as nothing more than distorted and garbled versions of the familiar stories from the Bible! Although my first impression of Holy Quran was unfavourable, I could not tear myself away from it. I read it almost continuously for three days and nights and when I had finished, all my strength had been drained away! Although I was only nineteen, I felt as weak as a woman of eighty. I never recovered my full strength or energy afterwards.

I continued to nurse this poor opinion of Holy Quran until one day I found in a bookshop a cheap paper-back edition of Muhammad Marmaduke Pickthall's translation. As soon as I opened that book, it proved a revelation! The powerful eloquence literally swept me off my feet. In the first paragraph of his preface, Pickthall wrote:

> The aim of this work is to present to English readers what Muslims the world over hold to be the meaning of

> the words of the Quran and the nature of that Book in not unworthy language and concisely with a view to the requirements of English-speaking Muslims. It may reasonably be claimed that no Holy Scripture can be fairly presented by one who disbelieves its inspiration and its message and this is the first English translation by an Englishman who is a Muslim. Some of the translations include commentations offensive to Muslims and almost all employ a style of language which Muslims at once recognize as unworthy. The Quran cannot be translated. That is the conviction of the old-fashioned *Shaikhs* and the view of the present writer. The book here is rendered almost literally and every effort is made to choose befitting language, but the result is not the Glorious Quran, that inimitable symphony, the very sounds of which move men to tears and ecstasy. It is only an attempt to present the meaning of the Quran—and, peradventure, something of the charm—in English. It can never take the place of the Quran in Arabic nor is it meant to do so.

I then realized why George Sale's translation was most unfair. From then on, I refused to read his or any other rendering of Holy Quran by non-Muslims. After reading Pickthall's rendition, I discovered other English translations by Yusuf Ali, Muhammad Ali Lahori and Maulana Abdul Majid Daryabadi. I found the commentation by Yusuf Ali and Muhammad Ali Lahori offensive because of their apologetic tone and far-fetched and unconvincing attempts to explain away those passages conflicting with modern philosophies or scientific concepts. Their translation of the Text was also weak. Although Maulana Daryabadi's attempt to pattern his translation of the Holy Quran on the archaic style of the King James' version of the Bible most annoyed me, I found his

commentary excellent, particularly those parts dealing with comparative religion and learned much from it. However, Pickthall's rendition remained my favourite and to this day, I have never found any other English translation that can equal it. The sweep of eloquence, the virility and dignity of the language is unsurpassed in any other translation. Most other translations commit the mistake of using the word "God" but Pickthall retains "Allah" throughout. This makes the message of Islam strike the Western reader as more authentic and effective. Throughout the darkest days during my years of hospitalization, I kept a paper-back edition of Pickthall's translation with me as my constant companion which I read over so many times, I must have worn to pieces a half dozen copies. May Allah abundantly reward Pickthall with the choicest blessings for making the knowledge about the Quran so easily and cheaply available to England and America! Were it not for him, I would not have been able to know and appreciate it.

After my discharge in 1959, I spent much of my leisure time reading books about Islam in the Oriental Division of the New York Public Library. It was there I discovered four bulky volumes of an English translation of *Mishkat ul Masabih* by Al-Haj Maulana Fazlur Rahman of Calcutta. It was then I learned that a proper and detailed understanding of Holy Quran is not possible without some knowledge of the relevant Hadith, for how can the Holy Text correctly be interpreted except by the Prophet to whom it was revealed? Those who disbelieve the Hadith also dis-

believe the Quran for its revelation explicitly tells us that one cannot follow what God wants us to do without an unquestioning acceptance of the authority of the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him).

Once I had studied the *Mishkat*, I began to accept the Holy Quran as Divine revelation. What persuaded me that the Quran must be from God and not composed by Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) was its satisfying and convincing answers to all the most important questions of life which I could not find elsewhere.

As a child, I was so mortally afraid of death, particularly the thought of my own death, that after nightmares about it, sometimes I would awaken my parents crying in the middle of the night. When I asked them why I had to die and what would happen to me after death, all they could say was that I had to accept the inevitable but that was a long way off and because medical science was constantly advancing, perhaps I would live to be a hundred years old! My parents, the remainder of my family and all our friends contemptuously rejected as superstition any thought of Hereafter, regarding Judgment Day, reward in Paradise or punishment in Hell as outmoded concepts of by-gone ages. In vain I searched all the verbose chapters of the Old Testament for any clear and unambiguous concept of Hereafter. The prophets, patriarchs and sages of the Bible all receive their rewards or punishments in this world. Typical is the story of Job (Hazrat Ayub). God destroyed all

his loved-ones, his possessions and afflicted him with loathesome disease in order to test his faith. Job plaintively laments to God why He should make a righteous man suffer? At the end of the story, God restores all his earthly losses but nothing is even mentioned about any possible consequences in the Hereafter. Although I did find the Hereafter mentioned in the New Testament, compared with that of Holy Quran, it is vague and ambiguous. I found no answer to the question of death in Orthodox Judaism, for the *Talmud* preaches that even the worst life is better than the best death. My parents' philosophy was that one must avoid contemplating the thought of death and just enjoy as best one can, the pleasures life has to offer at the moment. According to them, the purpose of life is enjoyment and pleasure achieved through self-expression of one's talents, the love of family, the congenial company of friends combined with the comfortable living and indulgence in the variety of amusements that affluent America makes available in such abundance. They deliberately cultivated this superficial approach to life as if it were the guarantee for their continued happiness and good-fortune. Through bitter experience I discovered that self-indulgence leads only to misery and that nothing great or even worthwhile is ever accomplished without struggle through adversity and self-sacrifice. From earliest childhood I have always wanted to accomplish important and significant things. Above all else, before my death I want the assurance that I have not wasted my life in sinful deeds or worthless pursuits. All my life I have been

intensely serious-minded. I have always detested the frivolity which is the dominant characteristic of contemporary culture. My father once disturbed me with his unsettling conviction that there is nothing of permanent value and because everything in this modern age continually changes all the time, the best we can do is accept the present trends as inevitable and adjust ourselves to them. I, however, was thirsty to attain something that would endure forever. It was from the Holy Quran where I learned that this aspiration was possible. No good deed for the sake of seeking the pleasure of God is ever wasted or lost. Even if the person concerned never achieves any worldly recognition, his reward is certain in the Hereafter. Conversely, Quran tells us that those who are guided by no moral considerations other than expediency or social conformity and crave the freedom to do as they please, no matter how much worldly success and prosperity they attain or how keenly they are able to relish the short span of their earthly life, will be doomed as the losers on Judgment Day. Islam teaches us that in order to devote our exclusive attention to fulfilling our duties to God and to our fellow-beings, we must abandon all vain and useless activities which distract us from this end. These teachings of Holy Quran, made even more explicit by Hadith, were thoroughly compatible with my temperament. When I embraced Islam, my parents, relatives and their friends regarded me almost as a fanatic, because I could think and talk of nothing else. To them, religion is a purely private concern which at the most perhaps could be cultivated like an amateur hobby among other hobbies. But as soon as

I read Holy Quran, I knew that Islam was no hobby but life itself!

From the onset of my adolescence until my migration to Pakistan at the age of twenty-eight, I was a hopeless misfit. A young girl as serious minded-as I was, always with a pile of books at the library, who abhorred the cinema, dancing and "pop" music, who did not enjoy "dating" and mixed parties and who took no interest in romance, glamour, cosmetics, jewelry or fashionable clothes, had to pay the full penalty of social ostracism for being "different."

From a bleak future in America, which had no place for a person like me, I escaped when I migrated to Pakistan. Although Pakistan, like every other Muslim country, is being increasingly contaminated by the most noxious dirt from Europe and America, still a sufficient number of Pakistanis remain good Muslims to provide an environment which makes it possible for the individual to lead a life in conformity to what Islam teaches. At times, I must admit, I fail to apply to my own life what Islam demands that we practice, but I never indulge in far-fetched interpretations of Quran or Sunnah to justify my weaknesses and shortcomings. Whenever I do wrong, I readily admit it and try my best to rectify my mistake. The happiness I have found in my new life is entirely due to the fact that just those qualities of character and temperament, Western society ridicules and scorns, in Islam are most keenly appreciated and esteemed.

## ISLAM VERSUS JUDAISM AND ZIONISM

Although virtually every Muslim today is keenly aware of the menace of Zionism, scarcely any among us, including even our most learned *ulema*, possesses a detailed knowledge of the Jewish religion. Even less understood are the reasons behind the striking similarities and departures of Judaism from Islam. This chapter has been written with the conviction that we cannot effectively combat our enemies until we first know who they are and specifically what motivates them to behave as they do. Any understanding of Zionism is impossible without some knowledge of Judaism and Jewish history. Zionism originated as a Jewish modernist movement under the impact of 19th-century European nationalism, imperialism and secularism and emerged bitterly hostile to traditional Judaism. It is crucial for our self-preservation to exploit the conflict between Judaism and Zionism to our best advantage. This we cannot accomplish until the widespread ignorance and popular misconceptions prevailing in Muslim lands about the Jews are swept away.

The Arabs and the Jews are both from the same Semitic stock. The Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace be on him) was from the descendants of Ishmael, son of Abraham (peace be on him), and therefore from amongst the brethren of Israel. The early history of Israel is, in fact, the history of the early Muslims. Every follower of Muhammad (peace be on him) accepts the followers of Moses as Muslims; it is so established from the Holy Quran. The separation took place only when the Judaic Muslim generation rejected Christ and by dissociating themselves from the

message of Christ, and not accepting him as God's Prophet, they became, not only unbelievers but also established a separate identity known as Jews. Similarly, some of the earliest followers of Jesus (peace be upon him) were also Muslims. The Christians, too, acted exactly as the Jews since they also disbelieved in the Prophet who was to come (*i.e.* the Holy Prophet Muhammad, peace be on him) and whose coming was foretold in the Bible and in all the previous ancient scriptures as was of Christ's in the Jewish scriptures. Thus the Christians ceased to be Muslims and became the followers of Christ When God addresses the Children of Israel of those days, He addresses the Jews and Christians as the "People of the Book," and this is the reason why the history of the Jews and Christians is mentioned so exhaustively in the Holy Quran The Jews were destined to make mischief twice and twice they were to be driven off from the land of Palestine. From the records of history, we know that the Jews were driven from Jerusalem in 588 B.C., but God forgave them and they returned and also prospered. But they made mischief again. They mocked God's prophets and persecuted Jesus (peace be on him). Thus the wrath of God fell on them more severely the second time in 70 A.D. They were completely routed by the Romans, their historical exodus took place and they settled in many parts of the world.

> It may be that your Lord will have mercy upon you again but if ye revert to your sins, We shall repeat the punishment and We have appointed Hell a dungeon for the disbelievers. (XVII : 8).

In the above *Ayat*, God promises the Jews mercy yet, provided they give up their mischief and accept the Holy Quran as a book of guidance and thus be entitled to a "magnificent reward." But the strange and unfortunate fact is that despite their severe punishment, the Jews still consider themselves the chosen people of God.

The one unsurpassing beauty of Islam is that the God of our faith is a universal God and that no one, not even the Muslims, are a "chosen people." Those alone are the chosen people who are true *Momins* (righteous, pious believers) who do not associate gods with God. Therefore the Muslims are as liable to punishment from God as the Jews and other nations. Consequently, we Muslims too have lost Jerusalem twice; once when lust and greed divided us into small and land-hungry states. Subsequently, however, we were united under the pious and inspiring leadership of Sultan Salah-ud-din Ayubi and drove out the Crusaders whose vast army comprised all the Christian states of those days. Now we are again divided and have degenerated to such an extent that many of our acts and deeds are not only repulsive and repugnant to Islam but are indeed flagrant violations of its basic tenets. We Muslims do deserve God's punishment which came when the Arabs, under President Nasser, were recently defeated—a most shameful and devastating defeat ever suffered by the Muslims in all history. If even now they do not turn to God but rely on help from Moscow or Washington and continue their intrigues against one another, they will be inviting more shame and more crushing defeat. The defeat of the Arabs in Palestine is not the defeat of Islam; it is the defeat of Arab socialism and Arab nationalism. But will the Arab nationalists and socialists return to Islam? Nay, in their shameful defeat they are blaming Islam as their scapegoat! They are deaf, dumb and blind who are bent upon destroying themselves, but in their pride and folly, they will not give up their mischief despite their shameful defeat.*

Recently my aunt who lives in New York sent me the following newsclipping which in her letter she

**Gog, Magog and Israel*, Ebrahim Ahmad Bawany, Begum Aisha Bawany Wakf, Karachi 1967, pp, 15-19.

enthusiastically praised as a hopeful beginning of a reconciliation between the Muslims and Jews :

"A MUSLIM ADDRESSES JEWS AT A CATSKILL CONVENTION" "A Muslim joined a rabbi on the platform yesterday at the United Synagogue of America convention on Kismesha Lake in the Catskills. It was the first time the Conservative Jewish organization had extended such an invitation to a Muslim. *Dr. Muhammad Abd-ur-Rauf*, Director of the Islamic Centre of New York City, which serves 60,000 Muslims, told his Jewish audience : "There is no use being in isolation. When you come together, you realize you are human beings. There is a common core of understanding each other's cause, religious values and aspirations as well as the extent of our differences. Dr. Rauf said Muslims mistakenly had been accused of being hostile to Jews. Rabbi Henry Siegman, executive vice-president of the Synagogue Council of America said : "The bitterness that has marked the modern encounter between Arab and Jew must not be allowed to obscure the fact that Judaism and Islam enjoy an affinity. If there is ever to occur a genuine reconciliation between Arab and Jew, as surely there must and will, then the basis of this reconciliation must be the shared religious values and the legacy of a cultural symbiosis unique in history."*

Coming in the wake of the recent Zionist aggression against Egypt, Jordan and Syria (June 5-9, 1967) where the most brutal atrocities were committed upon the Arabs with napalm, large chunks of Arab territory illegally occupied with the forcible expulsion of thousands of starving refugees, crowned with the Jewish conquest of Jerusalem and the desecration of the *Bait al-Muqqadas* and the threat of further aggression at any

*Quoted from *The New York Post*, New York City, November 7, 1967.

moment to occupy the Suez Canal combined with a claim to the right to hold Medina because Jews were dominant there before the victory of Islam—this event is most shocking! It further raises the question as to whether or not any basis exists for a reconciliation and peaceful co-existence between Muslim and Jew on the foundation of Islamic teachings.

Let us now examine what our Holy Quran has to say on this subject.

The second and much of the third *Surahs* of Holy Quran are explicitly addressed to the Jews where Allah has revealed that because they were the only people of antiquity who adhered to ethical monotheism, they were preferred by Him to all other nations and blessed with the greatest prophets and divine revelations in the Torah, the Psalms of David and the Gospel of Jesus (peace be upon him). However, God tells us in Holy Quran that for the sake of nationalism and racist pride, the Jews were guilty of the unpardonable sin of deliberately distorting their scriptures with interpolations and false interpretations and persecuting every prophet who was sent to redeem them. When the Jews of Medina rejected the mission of our Holy Prophet with an intense vehemence because they could not accept as their religious guide an unlettered Arab, the Holy Quran warns us that together with the idolaters, they will always be the fiercest and most treacherous of all our enemies. Holy Quran then curses them with exile, persecution and every kind of wretchedness until Resurrection Day when the disbelievers among them will be condemned to eternal punishment in Hell! Holy Quran furthermore warns (5 : 51)

that Muslims must not take the Jews or Christians for friends; they are the friends of each other and that whoever takes them for a friend has become one of them! God has punished the Muslims today (particularly in Zionist-occupied Palestine) with one calamity after another for shamelessly flouting this crucial injunction!

It is also reported in the *Mishkat* (a collection of the most authentic Hadith) that the Apostle of Allah predicted prior to the Hour of the destruction of this world, the Muslims will fight so much with the Jews and kill them until the survivors seek protection behind stones and trees which will then proclaim: "Oh Muslim warrior, servant of Allah, this is the Jew hiding behind me so come and kill him!"

How does the subsequent history of Jewish-Muslim relationships confirm or deny any possibility for friendly co-existence?

It is a fact that although the Jews of Medina had foretold the coming of another Prophet and some of their more learned rabbis even recognized the truth of Muhammad's (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) mission, despite repeated treaties of cooperation which at the first opportunity were broken, they proved to be the most treacherous of all the enemies of the Muslims, to such an extent that despite such close religious and racial affinities, the Jewish poets in Arabia went so far as to slander the honour of chaste Muslim women and praise the idolatry of the pagans as better than Islam! It was the wife of a slain Jewish warrior of Khaybar who put poison into the food of the Holy Prophet which caused the illness eventually

resulting in his death. Although after the conquest by the Muslims of Arabia, the Jews were at first allowed to live as a protected minority, they proved so treacherous and disloyal that finally Hazarat Umar ordered their wholesale expulsion to Syria. Muslim historians have charged Jewish hypocrisy and treachery under Abdullah bin Saba as responsible for the disturbances during the rule of Hazrat Uthman which finally ended in his martyrdom and the downfall of the pious Khalifate after the assassination of Hazrat Ali five years later. Many Muslim scholars lay the responsibility for the development of *Mutazilism* and other equally futile scholastic controversies as a product of some sophisticated Jews who hypocritically embraced Islam and then tried their best to subvert the faith with all kinds of innovations and heresies.

As early as 720 A.D., a Syrian Jew, Serene, organized a campaign for the capture of Jerusalem. He was defeated and slain. Some thirty years later, Obaidiah Abu Isa ben Ishaq of Isfahan led a Jewish revolt which failed. During the first Crusade, the Jewish communities were dreaming of a Messianic revival and were disillusioned by being massacred in Jerusalem along with the Muslims by the Christian crusaders. About 1125, a Messiah appeared in southern Arabia; the impostor was exposed by Maimonides. The Jews turned against the Muslims when the Mongols attacked and it was the Mongols who almost exterminated the Jewish community of Iraq at the destruction of Baghdad in 1258 A.D. In Spain, the son of the petition-writer, Samuel, who had been raised by Muslim magnanimity to the office and status of Prime Minister and Prince, was appointed to succeed his father to his office and title in 1055. He so lost his head that he began to dress like royalty and ridicule the Quran. He

> was killed in an Arab revolt in 1066. The Ottoman Empire was the haven of persecuted Jews fleeing Europe. Here too, peace, protection and prosperity turned the heads of the Jews. In 1648, Sabbatai, a Spanish immigrant, declared that he was the Messiah. His fame spread among Jews of Venice, Amsterdam, Hamburg and London. He was received with frenzied enthusiasm in Smyrna in 1665. When, however, he was arrested and brought before the Sultan, he forgot all about his divine mission and embraced Islam. Strangely enough, Sabbatai's followers transferred their allegiance to his brother-in-law, Jacob, who was revered as a Messiah, even as the incarnation of God. When, however, investigations commenced, he too embraced Islam and brought along most of his followers to form a new sect, half-Jewish half-Muslim called the *Donmehs*. The followers of this sect would visit mosques as well as the synagogues.*

This Jewish sect combined with the Freemasons to dominate the "Young Turk" movement which overthrew Sultan Abdul Hamid II in 1908 and, with the Ottoman defeat in World War I and the rise of Mustafa Kemal Ataturk, finally resulted in the complete destruction of the dynasty, the empire it ruled and the Khalifate in 1924.

But generally, with only relatively few exceptions, Jewish-Muslim relations were tolerably friendly from the crushing defeat the Jews suffered at the hands of the armies of the Holy Prophet at Medina until the rise of the modern Zionist movement. The Abbassid dynasty in what is today Iraq, the Ummayyad dynasty in Spain and Ottoman Turkey were especially hospitable to the Jews where they prospered and flourished

*"A Closer Look at Judaism," Iftikhar Ahmad, *The Pakistan Times*, Lahore, September, 24, 1967.

in large numbers. Today it is difficult for a Muslim to believe that the generation of his grandfather knew no enmity towards his Jewish neighbour. Here is a description of such friendly Muslim-Jewish relationships in Jerusalem at the turn of the century :

> That Muslims should co-exist peacefully with Christians is to be expected since Islam embraces many of the tenets of Christianity and recognises the spirituality of Christ: but that they should have been equally tolerant of Jews may seem strange when one thinks of the bitter strife between the two communities which the land was to witness only twenty years later. But the Jews who lived in Jerusalem in those days were very different from the Zionists who came afterwards. A few of them were descendants of families who had clung on in the country after the Diaspora but the majority were Sephardic Jews whose ancestors had found refuge in it after being expelled from Spain in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries and most of them were still entitled to the protection of the Spanish or some other foreign Consul because they had never taken Ottoman nationality. Whatever their origins, all these Jews were Arabic-speaking, ate Arab food (except the meat as it was not *Kosher*), enjoyed Arabic music and apart from a few *Ashkenazim* from Central Europe who had come into the country in the 19th century, and for the most part wore black *Kaftans* and skull caps with their hair in long ringlets, dressed as the Arabs did.
>
> With them the Muslims and the Christian Arabs associated on terms of virtual equality. On the Government level, non-discrimination had been a principle of Turkish policy ever since the Congress of Berlin a quarter of a century earlier and within the Ottoman Empire, Jews enjoyed as complete protection as anywhere in the world. They could aspire to the highest offices of State and indeed exercised great influence in Constantinople ; under the regime of Capitulations still in force, those of them with foreign

subjection could be sued only in the Consular Court of their nationality while under the parallel *millet* system even those who were Turkish citizens had the right to demand that any matter of personal status affecting them should be tried in their Rabbinical court—though many of them preferred voluntarily to refer such cases to the Muslim *Shari'at* Court. They were perfectly acceptable socially ; Musa bey Alami recalls that a family of Jews originally from Alleppo were among the closest friends of his parents and were almost nightly at their house ; and it was thought quite natural that not only he but several of his contemporaries, including at least two who subsequently became political leaders and violent opponents of Zionism, should have had "Jewish foster-brothers" at birth. Jews moreover filled a useful role in society. They were greatly in demand by Muslim notables and businessmen as secretaries and personal assistants, not only on account of their native intelligence but because many of them, having been educated at private schools where Arabic was better taught than in Government schools which the Muslims usually frequented, spoke and wrote better Arabic than many Muslims. In the countryside, most villages were dependent for their repairs and technical work generally, on itinerant Jewish artisans who worked a certain circuit, spending a night or two in each village and living entirely with the people by whom they were welcomed. Jewesses too, were prized in the towns by the better-class Muslim women who seldom ventured into the market to do the household shopping as they were trustworthy, and also hard bargainers and also as dressmakers for their contacts with co-religionists in Europe kept them abreast of the fashions. Musa bey Alami's mother, Zulaikha, had one who spent days on end in her household.

Few of these Jews could have known and fewer cared that in 1897, the very year of Musa bey Alami's birth, the First Annual Congress of the newly formed Zionist Organization held in Basle, had adopted as a goal "the establishment of Palestine as the National Home of the Jewish

People." It had no practical effect at the time; but it was the cloud no larger than a man's hand which fifty years later, was to become a hurricane to tear the country asunder and destroy the way of life of the Arab inhabitants.*

The rise of the modern Zionist movement brought more than a thousand years of friendly Muslim-Jewish relationships to an abrupt end, with the result that since the days of the Holy Prophet never has Jewish hatred towards Muslims nor Muslim hatred for Jews been more bitter than at the present time.

The most destructive of all Jewish conspiracies in history against the Muslims is the rise of the modern Zionist movement. Until the proclamation of the *Bolfour Declaration* in 1917, the relation between Christendom and Jewry was one of unremitting hostility, blackened by interminable chronicles of persecutions, massacres, oppressive measures which segregated the Jew of medieval Europe into the squalid *ghetto* as a pariah and impoverished them by denying them the right to own land, all means of livelihood except small-scale trade and usury. The increasing secularization of European society during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries broke down the *ghetto* and facilitated the cultural assimilation of the Jews into modern Western civilization, but the Dreyfus scandal in France and the intensified persecution of the Jews in Russia, Poland and other eastern European countries during the last days of the Czar, provoked the leading Jewish intellectuals of that time into the conviction that the Jews could never enjoy complete

**Palestine is My Country: The Story of Musa Alami,* Geoffrey, Furlonge, John Murray, London, 1969, pp. 27-28.

or genuine eqality with the gentiles unless they possessed a sovereign state of their own in Palestine. *The Balfour Declaration* in 1917 marked a turning point in Jewish-Christian relations. Through the clever diplomacy of Zionist leaders like Chaim Weizmann (see his took, *Trial and Error*) and David Ben-Gurion (see his book, *The Rebirth and Destiny of Israel*), Zionism joined hands with British imperialism to crush the political, economic and cultural independence of the Muslim world. After World War II, the American Government under the Truman administration, succumbed to Zionist pressure (as related in detail in Alfred Lilienthal's *What Price Israel?* Chicago, 1953) which resulted in the state of "Israel." The aggressive consiracy of Zionism against the neighbouring Arab-Muslim countries was glaringly exposed when "Israel", France and England made their combined attack upon Egypt in November 1956 to capture the newly-nationalized Suez Canal, and America's and England's enthusiastic support of "Israel" in her brutal invasion of Egypt, Jordan and Syria on June 5-9, 1967. The growing friendship of Christendom with Jewry was climaxed at the end of 1964, when Pope Paul dared reverse the most fundamental Christian dogma regarding the martyrdom of Christ (peace be upon him) and declared that the Jews must henceforth be absolved of all responsibility for the events leading to his alleged crucifixion.

"World Jewry has already conquered the Roman Catholic Church in the sense that Jewish thinking now dominates there and they are able to effect changes in the basic creed of Christianity. The most

astounding example of this is the Jewish success in amending the Catholic belief about the crucifixion of Jesus Christ at the hands of the Jews. Indeed the Jews had been at pains since long to do something about that. They made a very long term plan and trained a large number of Jewish scholars and intellectuals in the beliefs and practices of the Roman Catholic Church. They rose higher and higher in the Catholic priestly hierarchy until their influence at the top levels grew so strong that they were able to achieve whatever they liked." Thus during the Oecumenical Council which held from September 14th to November 21, 1964, the Vatican decided to absolve the Jews of all responsibility for the alleged death of Jesus by crucifixion. The Jewish conspiracy in this regard is too obvious to need any more comment.* The Text runs as follows:

> As this Sacred Synod searches into the mystery of the Church, it remembers the bonds that ties the people of the New Covenant to Abraham's stock. With a grateful heart, the Church of Christ acknowledges that according to God's saving design, the beginnings of her faith and her election were already among the patriarchs, Moses and the prophets. She professes that all who believe in Christ—Abraham's sons according to faith—were included in the same patriarch's call, likewise that her salvation is typically foreshadowed by the Chosen People's exodus from the land of bondage. The Church, therefore, cannot forget that she received the revelation of the Old Testament from the people with whom God in His ineffable mercy concluded the former Covenant. Nor can she forget that she feeds

*_The Jewish Conspiracy and the Muslim World,_ Misbahul Islam Faruqi, Karachi, 1967 p. 94.

upon the root of that cultivated olive tree onto which the wild shoots of the Gentiles have been grafted. Indeed, the Church believes that by His cross that Christ, our Peace reconciled the Jews and Gentiles, making both one. The Church keeps ever in mind the words of the Apostle about his kinsmen: "Theirs is the sonship, the glory, the covenants, the giving of the Law, the worship and the promises. Theirs are the patriarchs and of them is the Christ according to the flesh, the Son of Mary, the Virgin" (Romans 9 : 4-5). No less does she recall that the Apostles, the mainstay of the Church and her pillars as well as most of the early disciples who proclaimed Christ's gospel to the world, sprang from the Jewish people. Even though a large part of the Jews did not accept the Gospel, they remain dear to God for the sake of the patriarchs. This is the witness of the Apostles as if the utterance that God's gifts and call are irrevocable. In company with the prophets and the same Apostle, the Church awaits the day known to God alone on which all peoples will address the Lord in a single voice and serve Him shoulder to shoulder. Since the spiritual patrimony common to Christians and Jews is of such magnitude, this Sacred Synod wants to support and recommend their mutual knowledge and respect, acknowledge and respect that are the fruit above all, of biblical and theological studies as well as of fraternal dialogues. Moreover, this Synod in her rejection of injustice of whatever kind and wherever inflicted upon men, remains mindful of that common patrimony and so deplores, indeed condemns hatred and persecutions of Jews whether they arose in former or in our own days. May they never present the Jewish people as one rejected, cursed or guilty of deicide. All that happened to Christ in His passion cannot be attributed to the whole people then alive, much less to that of today. Besides, the Church has always held and holds now that Christ underwent His passion and death freely because of the sins of all men and out of infinite love. It is therefore the burden of Christian preaching to proclaim

the Cross of Christ as the sign of God's all-embracing love and as the fountain from which every grace flows.*

So destructive a role has Jewry played against the integrity of the Muslim world (particularly since the rise of the modern Zionist movement under the leadership of Theodor Herzl in 1896) that more than one Muslim thinker has made the sweeping charge that "Jews have always collaborated with the enemies of the Muslims and that whenever a calamity struck in Islamic history, Jews have been responsible, directly or indirectly, overtly or covertly."**

The irreconcilability of the welfare of the Jews as opposed to the interests of the Muslims has prevailed throughout history but the significant exceptions must not be forgotten. However much the Quran may curse the Jews for their sins and transgressions, the revelation from Allah neverthless declares that *not all of them were guilty* and that some of the *Bani Israil* can be included as among the true believers. All the most important Prophets mentioned in Holy Quran before Muhammad (peace and blessing of Allah be upon him) were of the *Bani Israil* and it is a fact of history that the Jews were the only people of antiquity who not only professed ethical monotheism but whose very existence centered round this faith. Under Greek and Roman domination, they put up the most strenuous resistance against paganism. The Jewish rebellions

*The Muslims and the Vatican Oecumenical Council," Allal a.-Fasi, *The Islamic Review*, Woking, February 1965, pp. 16-18.

***The Jewish Conspiracy and the Muslim World with the complete text of the Protocols of the Learned Leaders of Zion,* edited by Misbahul Islam Farooqi, Karachi, 1967, p. 24.

against the Greeks and Romans were not motivated by secular patriotism but inspired with the passionate zeal to defend and preserve the faith in the unity of God and the necessity to obey the divine law in the Torah. There was Hannah who gladly sacrificed the lives of all seven of her sons as martyrs because they refused to forsake their faith in God and the Torah and would not under any circumstances bow down before the idols of their conquerors. There were Jews who preferred to be tortured to death rather than eat swine-flesh or any other forbidden food. Under the rule of the Greeks, there were many rabbis who condemned their pagan practices in the strongest and most vehement terms and who refused to tolerate their gymnasiums and stadiums where the participating athletes performed stark naked in honour of their gods. Before the advent of Christianity, the Jews put up the fiercest resistance against the sadism of the Roman "games" where gladiators fought each other to the death and thousands of animals were subjected to the cruelest mutilation and suffering, not to mention the tens of thousands of human victims who perished in the arena for the amusement of the Roman mobs. These are the Jews who may well be included as among the believers. (God knows best).

That the Jews of Arabia vehemently rejected the mission of our Holy Prophet, not on religious but racial grounds, is made clear by Holy Quran where it is stated (XXV : 197) the learned rabbis knew his message was true. It was their nationalist pride which made an unlettered Prophet from among the Arabs utterly unacceptable to them as their guide, even

though the Arabs were their nearest kin. There were others among the Jews who embraced Islam hypocritically in order to subvert it from within. But there were still some Jews who became sincere Muslims such as Abdullah ibn Salam and Mukhairiq, both of whom had been learned rabbis in Medina and the latter a man of considerable property, all of which he gladly sacrificed for the Islamic cause. One of the earliest authentic biographies of the Holy Prophet by Ibn Ishaq tells us that Safiya, the wife of the Jewish chieftain of Khaybar, had recognized the truth of the Holy Prophet's mission and wanted to embrace Islam long before the decisive battle of Khaybar took place when her husband was slain. After the battle, Safiya became one of the wives of the Holy Prophet and is held in esteem by all Muslims as among the Mothers of the Believers. In the *Mishkat-ul-Masabih* there is a Hadith where Anas reported that Hafsah (another of the Prophet's wives, the daughter of Hazrat Umar and noted for quick temper and sharp tongue), taunted Safiya because of her Jewish origin. When Safiya came to the Prophet weeping, he comforted her by saying, "You are certainly the daughter of a Prophet and now you are the wife of a Prophet so what has she to boast over you?" The Prophet then rebuked Hafsah and reminded her to fear Allah. (Tirmidhi, Nisai) In modern times among exceptional sincere converts of Jewish origin were Kiamil Pasha, a Grand Vizier under Sultan Abdul Hamid II and even more recently, the Austrian-born (1901- ) Muhammad Asad (formerly Leopold Weiss) who embraced Islam in 1927 and

became a noted Arabic scholar and an authority on Islamic Law. While I saw still living in New York after my conversion in 1961, of all my Muslim acquaintances the most gentle, steadfastly devout and deeply pious was a young pharmacist with a long, full red beard named Ameer Rashid whose father was born a Jew in Vienna and embraced Islam in 1924 but whose mother remained Jewish. Fortunately this caused no domestic strife and his mother and father continued to be happily married despite their religious differences. In 1957 both father and son performed *Haj* and *Umrah* and on their journey home, Ameer Rashid had taken a beautiful Turkish wife. During my youth, my growing sympathy for Islam enraged the other Jews I knew who accused me of being a traitor to my own people. Repeatedly they warned me that even if tried to become a Muslim, because of their intense hatred for Jews, they would never accept me. Much Zionist propaganda was printed in New York at that time condemning the Muslims and particularly the Arab Muslims, as no different from the Nazis in their attempts to exterminate the Jews in Palestine. How happy I was to find that none of these charges contained any truth ! I have never been stigmatized by any Muslim since my conversion because of my Jewish origin and as soon as I became a Muslim, I found myself at once welcomed most enthusiastically as one of them. This proves that whatever hostility exists between Jews and Muslims, is based upon ideological and not racial grounds.

Among the redeeming exceptions in the history of Jewish-Muslim relationships, have been a number of

eminent Jews who, although may be lacking in any feeling of loyalty to Muslim rule or sympathy for the Islamic cause, still could not be considered as our avowed enemies either. Included in this category are the entire galaxy of Jewish scholars who lived under Muslim rule, such as Saadia ben Joseph, Gaon of the Jewish Academy of Sura (Iraq) in the 9th century who after Rashi is regarded by Jews as their greatest biblical commentator and who so zealously defended the Talmud against the *Qaraite* rationalist heresy, that Maimonides said were it not for him, the Torah would have disappeared; and such Jewish luminaries in eleventh-century Muslim Spain as the poet-philosopher, Solomon; Ibn Gabriol : the poet, Moses ben Ezra, the poet and biblical commentator Abraham Ibn Ezra; the Jewish mystic, Bahya Ibn Pakuda who wrote his religious treatise on *Duties of the Heart* and the greatest of all the Jewish poets in Muslim Spain, Yehuda Ha-Levi. Besides his poetry, Yehuda Ha-Levi also won fame for his essay entitled the *Kuzari* which is a dialogue between the King of the Khazars in Russia and a rabbi arguing why Judaism is supposedly superior to Christianity and Islam. Paradoxically, although this was intended for missionary endeavour, the *Kuzari* argued not only for the religious supremacy but also for the racial superiority of the Jews as well. In the eighth century, the Khazars had accepted Judaism only to have their kingdom crushed by the Slavic Russians two centuries afterwards. In contrast to the wretched conditions of the Jews in Christian-dominated medieval Europe, Ha-Levi felt no gratitude for the benefits he enjoyed under Muslim rule but described

himself in his poetry as "enslaved in Arab chains." Continually he lamented broken-hearted over the ruins of Zion until at last he went to Palestine where it was rumored that he was slain there by an Arab although this was never confirmed. All these Jews under Muslim rule wrote either in Arabic or Arabic using Hebrew script. Their devotional poetry is included as an integral part of the standard orthodox Jewish prayer-book recited by the pious Jew daily in the synagogue.

The greatest and most famous of all the eminent Jews under the rule of the Muslims was Musa ibn Maimun, better known as Maimonides. Born in Spain, he and his family were compelled to flee to Morocco due to the decline of Muslim power and the vicious anti-Jewish propaganda of the Dominican order. Maimonides received his higher education at the Qarawiyin University Mosque in Fez. When he fell among Berber fanatics, in order to save his life, he pretended to be a Muslim for some nine years. In search of better conditions, he finally migrated to Cairo where he spent the remainder of his life. On his reversion to Judaism in Egypt, he was charged by his enemies with apostasy. However, when brought before the *Qadi*, he declared that since Maimonides had never accepted Islam sincerely or voluntarily and the Holy Quran forbids forcible conversion, he was not guilty and therefore no punishment could be inflicted upon him. In defence of the Jewish faith, Maimonides wrote in Arabic his *Guide to the Perplexed*, where he tried to base all his arguments on rational grounds and harmonize Greek philosophy with Divine revelation. Maimonides also practiced medicine and was so highly

esteemed in this field that Salah-ud-din Ayubi chose him for his personal physician. After his death, his medical works, which were strongly influenced by Ibn Sina and al-Razi, were completed by his sister's son who was a Muslim. It is significant that Abraham, a son of Maimonides and also a leader of the Jewish community of Cairo, was eager to change the established synagogue service and make it more like the mosque, reintroducing prostrations into the Jewish prayers, making his congregation kneel upon the matted or carpeted floor instead of sitting upon cushioned benches and insisting upon the order and decorum which the long drawn-out ritual of the synagogue customarily lacks. His reforms, however, were not successful.

Moritz Steinschneider, an outstanding German-Jewish scholar, in his *Introduction to the Arabic Literature of the Jews* which he wrote at the age of ninety, compared the German-Jewish with the Arab-Jewish symbiosis, regarding the two as of equal importance. Here, however, I venture to disagree with the great master. Despite their relative importance, none of the creations of the Jewish authors wri ing in German or conceived under the impact of modern Western civilization has reached all parts of the Jewish people or has influenced the personal inner life of every Jew to the profound degree as did the great Jewish writers who belonged to the medieval civilization of Arab Islam. The reason for this differnce is self-evident. **Modern Western civilization, like the ancient civilization of the Greeks, is essentially at variance with the religious culture of the Jewish people.** Islam, however, is from the very flesh and bone of Judaism. It is, so to say, a recast, an enlargement of the latter just as Arabic is closely related to Hebrew. Therefore Judaism could draw freely

and copiously from Muslim civilization and at the same time preserve its independence and integrity far more completely than it was able to in the modern world or in the Hellenistic society of Alexandria. It is very instructive to compare the utterances of Jewish authors of the Middle Ages about Islam and the Arabs with those of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries which deal with a surrounding culture, for instance, *Germanism and Judaism* by Hermann Cohen. In Cohen's book, Judaism is "justified" because it is regarded (rightly or wrongly) as essentially identical with the highest attainments of German thinking. However, most of the Jewish authors of the Middle Ages who wrote in Arabic, never had the slightest doubt about the absolute superiority of Judaism. I emphasize this fact, not because I believe that such an attitude should be adopted in our times, but simply as an indication that Judaism inside Islam was an autonomous culture sure of itself, despite and possibly because of its intimate connection with its environment. **Never has Judaism encountered such a close and fructitious symbiosis as that with the medieval civilizations of Arab Islam.***

However, the Jews could not be satisfied with their status as *dhimmis* under Muslim rule. Therefore this Jewish scholar in the same book qualifies his glowing tribute to the magnanimity of Muslim culture and after condemning the practice of the *Shariah* in modern Saudi Arabia and Yemen, he writes :

Far more serious is the professed aim of the Muslim Brotherhood, which boasts of the allegiance of the majority of the Egyptian people, to reinstate Islam as the law of the state. If the Muslim Brotherhood and their counterparts

* *Jews and Arabs—their Contacts through the Ages.* Solomon David Goitein, Chairman, School of Oriental Studies, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Schocken books, New York, 1955, pp. 129-130.

in other countries have their way, it would mean inexorably that Egypt and the other countries involved would relapse into the position of medieval states with local Christians and Jews reduced to the status of second-class citizens. The leaders of the military revolution in Egypt understood this issue only too well and fought the Brotherhood. For a religious law, a law professedly made by God Himself, can never be changed in such essentials as the position of the "unbelievers"; therefore, the only way to honor it under entirely changed conditions is not to use it. The introduction of modern civil codes in Egypt and Turkey has done no harm to Islam but rather saved it from becoming a target of justified criticism. The very idea that Egypt could give up attainments made eighty years ago when a modern civil code was first introduced, sounds really preposterous. This lapse into contemporary issues lends color to the exposition of Jewish-Arab relations under Islam. As we have seen, the position of the Jews inside Arab Muslim society was relatively better than enjoyed by them in Christian medieval Europe. But only relatively. In principle, they and the other non-Muslims were second-class citizens and consequently their position was always precarious and often actually dangerous. No discrimination on any grounds, religious or otherwise, can be the basis of a completely satisfactory symbiosis.*

This quotation is representative of modern Jewish scholarship as a whole and provides sufficient proof that the Jews are the most implacable enemies of an Islamic revival.

Now let us examine the beliefs and practices of Judaism, taking special note where they agree with Islam, where they differ and for what reasons.

**Ibid.*, pp. 87-88.

The creed of Judaism, known as the *Shema* runs as follows :

*"Shema Yisroel! Adonoi elaheynu adonoi achud!"* which means, "Hear, Oh Israel! The Lord our God, the Lord is One!"

The *Shema* is to Jews what the *Kalimah* is to Muslims and as every pious Muslim yearns to die reciting the *Kalimah*, the pious Jew dies with the *Shema* on his lips. The remainder of the *Shema* in detail reads :

> You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your might. And these words which I command you today shall be in your heart. You shall teach them diligently to your children and you shall speak of them when you are sitting at home and when you go on a journey, when you lie down and when you rise up. You shall bind them for a sign on your hand and they shall be for frontlets between your eyes. You shall inscribe them on the doorposts of your house and on your gates. (Deuteronomy 6 : 4-9).

The ethics of Judaism is based upon "*The Ten Commandments*" (Exodus 10: 1-17).

God spoke all these words saying:

1. I am the Lord your God who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of slavery.
2. You shall have no other gods beside Me! You shall not make for yourself any idols in the shape of anything that is in the heaven above or that is on the earth below or that is in the water under the earth. You shall not bow down to them nor worship them for I, the Lord your God am a jealous God, punishing children for the sins of their fathers down to the third or fourth generation of those who hate Me, but showing kindness to the thousandth generation of those who love Me and keep My commandments.

3. You shall not utter the name of the Lord, your God in vain for the Lord will not hold guiltless any one who utters His name in vain.
4. Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days you shall labor and do all your work but on the seventh day, which is a day of rest in honor of the Lord your God, you shall not do any work, neither you nor your son nor your daughter nor your male or female servant nor your cattle nor the stranger who is within your gates, for in six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth and all that they contain and rested on the seventh day; therefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and sanctified it.
5. Honor your father and mother that you may live long in the land which the Lord your God is giving you.
6. You shall not murder.
7. You shall not commit adultery.
8. You shall not steal.
9. You shall not testify against your neighbor.
10. You shall not covet your neighbor's house; you shall not covet your neighbor's wife, or his servant, male or female, nor his ox nor his ass or anything that belongs to your neighbor.

There is also the further commandment in *Leviticus* that :

"You shall love your neighbor as you love yourself."

Maimonides summarized the doctrines of Judaism in his *Thirteen Principles of Faith* which the pious Jew faithfully recites in the synagogue daily :

1. I firmly believe that the Creator, blessed be His name, is the Creator and Ruler of all created beings, and that He alone has made, does make and ever will make all things.
2. I firmly believe that the Creator, blessed be His name, is One; that there is no Oneness in any form like His; and that He alone was, is, and ever will be our God.

3. I firmly believe that the Creator, blessed be His name, is not corporeal, that no bodily accidents apply to Him and that there exists nothing whatever that resembles Him.
4. I firmly believe that the Creator, blessed be His name, was the first and will be the last.
5. I firmly believe that the Creator, blessed be His name, is the only One to Whom it is proper to address our prayers and that we must not pray to anyone or anything else.
6. I firmly believe that all the words of the Prophets are true.
7. I firmly believe that the prophecy of Moses, our teacher (may he rest in peace), was true and that he was the chief of the prophets both of those who preceded and those who followed him.
8. I firmly believe that the whole *Torah* which we now possess is the same which was given to Moses, our teacher, (may he rest in peace) !
9. I firmly believe that this *Torah* will not be changed and that there will be no other *Torah* given by the Creator, blessed be His name.
10. I firmly believe that the Creator, blessed be His name, knows all the actions and thoughts of human beings, as it is said: "It is He who fashions the hearts of them all and He who notes all their deeds." (Psalm 33 : 15).
11. I firmly believe that the Creator, blessed be His name, rewards those who keep His commandments and punishes those who transgress them.
12. I firmly believe in the coming of the Messiah and although he may tarry, I daily wait for his coming.
13. I firmly believe that there will be a resurrection of the dead at a time which will please the Creator, blessed and exalted be His name for ever and ever.

    For Thy salvation I hope, Oh Lord! I hope Oh Lord, for Thy salvation! O Lord, Thy salvation I hope!

Like Islam, Judaism is strictly monotheistic. No believing Jew doubts the unity of God. But from the Muslim point of view, the monotheism of Judaism is ruined by its nationalistic, exclusive overtones which are reflected even in the *Shema*, Although theoretically the Jew professes to believe in God as the Creator and Ruler of the universe and all mankind, in their scriptures He is mainly concerned with the Jews as His chosen people. True enough, the pious Jew will insist that God preferred the *Bani Israil*, not on racial grounds, but because they alone of all the nations in the world accepted the Covenant to obey His divine laws as revealed to Moses. However, it cannot be denied that Jews have always considered this Covenant as binding only upon themselves. Not only do Jews fail to preach their faith to others but they do not welcome converts. In all history I know of only two instances where non-Jews accepted Judaism *en masse*—in Yemen some centuries prior to the birth of our Holy Prophet and the tiny, short-lived kingdom of the Khazars, who were of Tartar origin, in Russia. Whenever a rare convert does enter the Jewish fold, (which is almost always due to marriage because Jewish law does not recognize the marriage of a Jew to a non-Jew), his motivations are suspect. Other Jews will question him as to why he wants to take upon himself the burden of their Law and endure all the persecution, discrimination, oppression and other troubles which have always been their fate? One of my acquaintances in New York, a beautiful young Christian girl, was intent upon marrying a Jew. She told me that in order to marry this man,

it was mandatory for her to accept Judaism as her faith and for this purpose she went daily to the synagogue where she was carefully instructed by the rabbi. She further confided to me that if the rabbi so chose, he had the power to reject her as a Jew so that she could never marry him! One of my mother's best friends during my childhood was a blonde German refugee who had married a Jew, but despite her fervent belief in the faith of Judaism, she was never accepted by the Jewish community on the same basis as a born Jew. Although there are exceptions to this rule of excluding converts (as illustrated in the moving story of *Ruth* in the Bible), the intolerance of nationalism permeates every aspect of Jewish life. Even the most deeply pious Jew who insists that the only *raison d'etre* of the *Bani Israil* is to uphold God's holy *Torah* and obey His Divine laws, will in the same breath declare without hesitation that anyone born of Jewish parents is always a Jew even should he or she embrace atheism and renounce all the beliefs and practices of the Jewish religion! Most modern Jews today have done exactly that! In the orthodox *Yeshiva University* in New York, I was struck by the prominent place given to a portrait of Albert Einstein, the celebrated mathematician and scientist, hung on the wall in the office of the rabbi. Even though Einstein never adhered to any of the beliefs or practices of Judaism, his Jewish ancestry is sufficient to inspire even the most pious rabbis to point to him with the greatest pride and regard his scientific achievements as part of the cultural heritage of the Jews. Jews regard Sigmund Freud and Karl Marx in a similar fashion. Shortly

after the establishment of the state of "Israel" in 1948, I remember listening to an interview over the radio where a Zionist leader asked a prominent rabbi of New York which the faith of Judaism regarded as more important—belief in God's *Torah* and obedience to its laws or loyalty to the Jewish people? Without any hesitation, the rabbi replied that loyalty to the Jewish people was far more essential to Judaism than belief in God. How characteristic this is of Jews everywhere! The nationalism and racism of Judaism have reduced it to the narrow, parochial and moribund faith that it is today. It virtually nullifies their profession of God as the Creator and Ruler of the universe and mankind. It degrades their whole concept of monotheism.

Like the Christian New Testament, the Jewish Old Testament frequently portrays God in the colors of the crudest materialism : As the Bible tells us about Moses receiving the Covenant of the sacred Law on Mount Sinai :

> And it came to pass as Moses entered into the taberncale, the cloudy pillar descended and stood at the door of the tabernacle and the Lord talked with Moses. And all the people saw the cloudy pillar stand at the tabernacle door and all the people rose up and worshipped, every man at his tent door. *And the Lord spake unto Moses face to face as a man speaketh unto his friend....* And he (Moses) said, I beseech Thee, show me Thy glory, and He (God) said, Thou cannot see My face for there shall be no man to see Me and live....But I will take away Mine hand and *thou shalt see My back parts** but My face shall not be seen. (*Exodus :* Chapter 35).

*The famous European artist, Michelangelo painted this scene on the Sistine Chapel in Rome during the 15th century which is a major tourist attraction today.

Here is how the Holy Quran corrects this blasphemous interpolation of the Jewish scriptures :

> And when We did appoint for Moses thirty nights (of solitude on Mount Sinai) and added to them ten and he completed the whole time appointed by his Lord of forty nights and Moses said unto his brother (Aaron), Take my place among the people. Do right and follow not the way of mischief-makers. And when Moses came to Our appointed place and his Lord had spoken unto him, he said: My Lord! Show Me Thyself that I may gaze upon Thee. He (God) said: *Thou wilt not see Me* but gaze upon the mountain! If it stand still in its place, then thou wilt see Me. And when his Lord revealed His glory to the mountain, He sent it crashing down. And Moses fell down senseless. And when he woke, he said. Glory unto Thee! *I turn unto Thee repentant* and I am the first of true believers. He (God) said, O Moses! I have preferred thee above mankind by My messages and and by My speaking unto thee so obey that which I have given thee (the Covenant) and be among the thankful. (VII : 142-144).

Judaism confirms the belief in the prophets but what a contrast the prophets in the Bible display from our Holy Quran! Moses is regarded by Jews with the same supremacy as Muslims regarded Muhammad (peace and blessings be upon him), because it was to him that God revealed the Covenant of all the laws which are regarded as the sacred and only authoritative code of life that all Jews are obliged to follow. Adam, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, David. Solomon and Job, although revered by the Jews as patriarchs and kings, are not regarded as prophets by the Bible. Lesser prophets of the later books of the

Old Testament which command great respect among Jews and Christians, such as Isaiah, Amos, Hosea, Jeremiah, Nathan and Daniel are not mentioned in our Quran. For Ismail (peace be upon him) who is given the dignity of a genuine Prophet in Quran, Jews have nothing but contempt and thus their scriptures condemn him as "a wild man of the desert whose hand shall be against every man and every man's hand raised against him." The Jewish contempt for Ismail as the ancestor of the Arabs is clearly based on racial grounds.

> And Sarah saw the son of Hagar, the Egyptian, which she had borne unto Abraham, mocking. Wherefore she said unto Abraham, "Cast out this bondwoman and her son, Ishmael, for the son of this bondwoman shall not be heir with my son, Isaac." And the thing was very grievous in Abraham's sight because of his son (Ishmael). And God said unto Abraham, "Let it not be grievous in thy sight because of the lad and because of the bondwoman; in all that Sarah hath said unto thee, hearken to her voice, for in Isaac shall thy seed be called"....And Abraham rose up early in the morning and took bread and a bottle of water and gave it unto Hagar, putting it on her shoulder and sent her and the child away and she departed and wandered into the wilderness of Beersheba....And the water was spent in the bottle and she cast the child under one of the shrubs....and she sat against him and lifted up her voice and wept. And God heard the voice of the lad and the angel of God called to Hagar out of heaven and said unto her...."Arise, lift up the lad and hold him in thine hand for I will make him a great nation......". (Genesis 21 : 18).

For this reason, in the book of *Genesis* (chapter 22), it is Isaac whom God commands Abraham to sacrifice

as a test for the steadfastness of his faith. The interpolation is very clear when God says to Abraham, "Take now thy son, thine *only* son, Isaac whom thou lovest and offer him to Me for a burnt offering...." Now it is a fact that Ismail was born *before* Isaac but the Jewish and Christian biblical commentators explain this away on the grounds that at Sarah's demand, Ismail was disinherited because his mother, Hagar, was not his real wife but only a slave-concubine!

St. Paul's Epsitles in the New Testament condemn Ismail and his descendants even more vehemently than the Old Testament.

> Tell me ye that desire to be under the Law; do ye not hear the Law? For it is written that Abraham had two sons, the one by the bondwoman, the other by the freewoman. But he (Ismail) who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh but he of the freewoman was by promise....Now we (Christian) brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise. But since he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now. Nevertheless what saith the Scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman. So therefore we (Christians) brethren are not children of the bondwoman but of the free. (Gelatians 4 : 21-31)

Here the hostility of the Jews against the Arabs is evident even at this early date.

The Holy Quran corrects the Bible in making Ismail a genuine Prophet of God and his mother, Hagar, Abraham's legitimate wife. Ismail was not disinherited nor cast out but together he and his father, Abraham, built the *Kaaba* in Mecca as the symbol of

worship of the one true God and it was Ismail—not Isaac—whom God commands Abraham to sacrifice.

Even though they were *Bani Israil* by birth, the Jews furiously disowned John and Jesus Christ (peace be upon them) as heretics because the universal message they preached could not be reconciled with their fanatical racism and nationalism as the story of the Good Samaritan in the New Testament illustrates:

> As if the people of Judea in the days of Jesus were not exasperated with "Jewish" political nationalism! They were soon going to be delivered from the opportunism of the Maccabee descendants who defiled pure Judaism and Jewishness through their political nationalism: greed on one hand and sycophantic imitation of Hellenism on the other. As I write these lines, I recall my long-forgotten childhood days, or rather nights, when my *Heder* and *Yeshiva* (elementary and higher Talmudical Hebrew schools) in Jerusalem called a complete halt to the study of the Torah and Talmud one night every winter. It must have been on Christmas eve, the birthday of Jesus of Nazareth. Our teacher then used to indulge in slighting traditional stories ridiculing Jesus Christ, the *Acher* ("Strange One", "Other One") or *Yoshkeh Pandreh* as we children were made to nickname Jesus.*

Jews regard our Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) with the most intense hatred, condemn him as an impostor and our Holy Quran as a fraud! Not only were the Jews guilty of persecuting their prophets during their lifetimes but they have spared no effort to slander them after their deaths. For instance in the Book of *Genesis*, it is related that one day Noah became very drunk with wine and

***The Decadence of Judaism in our Time*, **Moshe Menuhin**, Exposition Press, New York, 1965, p. 269.

while he was lying uncovered inside his tent, one of his sons, Ham, entered and covered him. Because Ham accidentally saw his father's nakedness, God turned his skin black and cursed all his descendants with slavery! As the Bani Israil gradually fell prey to pagan ideas, they portrayed their great prophets as criminals and sinners of the lowest order. Here are only a few examples of these vulgar and obscene stories to be found throughout the present versions of the Old Testament :

The Prophet Abraham is said to have administered an oath of loyalty to his servant when he was about to leave for Mesopotamia by putting his hand under his thigh in the pagan manner. (Genesis 24 : 2-7)

The Prophet Lot is alleged to have committed rape on his two daughters while staying at Segor after the destruction of Sodom and most shamelessly these girls are said to have given birth to the illegitimate children of their own father! (Genesis 9 : 29-36)

The Prophet Jacob is accused of cheating his father, Prophet Isaac (Ishaq) and then marrying two sisters at one time. (Genesis 29 : 15-18)

Then in the House of Jacob, his son is reported to have raped his daughter-in-law. (Samuel 13 : 172)

The Book of Kings in the Old Testament tells us that one day at dusk, while King David was gazing down from his palace roof, he saw a beautiful woman named Bethsabee bathing and immediately was stricken with unquenchable lust for her. David forcibly raped her and then treacherously slew her husband, Uriah so he could have her to himself. From this illicit union, Solomon was born! The Bible tells us

that King Solomon "The Wise," favoured pagan women for his wives and eventually turned to idol-worshipping. (II Samuel 2 : 1-17, 26-27)

Then Ammon, one of David's sons, is alleged to have raped his sister. Although David was saddened, he did not punish him. At last David's second son, Absolom killed Ammon and fled away. (II Samuel 13 : 11-14)

After that, Absolom became a rebel, fought against his father, David and defeated him. After capturing his father's harem, he committed rape on all of his step-mothers in public in order to insult his father, the Prophet David. (II Samuel 16 : 21-22)

This is what the Jews have done to their Prophets! Even the most cursory comparison between the manner in which the Bible deals with the prophets in contrast to the Quran, which absolves them of all these crimes, reveals how the concept of prophecy has been degraded in the Jewish religion.

Islam literally means peace through submission to the will of God. The name "Judaism" is taken from one of the twelve tribes of *Bani Israil*. Therefore a Jew, literally speaking, belongs to the tribe of Judah. Thus the exclusive, nationalist character of this religion is reflected even in its name. Nevertheless, there were still some Jews who did attain peace through serene resignation to God's will. For example, it is related in the Talmud :

> It happened that while Rabbi Meir was lecturing in the House of Study on the afternoon of the Sabbath, his two sons died at home. Their mother laid them upon a bed and covered them with a sheet. At the termination of the

> Sabbath, the Rabbi returned to his home and asked where the children were. His wife said to him : "I want to ask you a question. Some time ago a person came here and entrusted a valuable article to my care and now he wants it back. Shall I restore it to him or not?" He answered, "Surely a pledge must be restored to its owner." She then said, "Without asking for your consent I gave it back to Him." Thereupon she removed the sheet from off the bodies. When he saw them, he wept bitterly and she said to her husband, "Did you not tell me that what has been entrusted to one's keeping must be restored on demand? The Lord gave and the Lord taketh away. Blessed be the name of the Lord."*

This rabbi and his wife may have been true believers. (God knows best). Here is the Muslim counterpart with the identical morale:

> Umm Sulaim (*radhiallahu anha*) was the mother of Anas (*radhiallahu anha*). After the death of her first husband, she was married to Abu Talhah Ansari and bore him a son named Abu Umair. Often the Holy Prophet visited the house to play with the child. One day Abu Umair fell ill while his father was fasting. While Abu Talhah was out at work, the child died. The mother washed and enshrouded the dead body and laid it on a cot. When her husband returned home and was partaking of his *Iftar* meal, he inquired about the child. The wife assured him that he was now in greater comfort than before. When they arose in the morning, the following conversation took place :
>
> Umm Sulaim : "I have a question to ask you."
>
> Abu Talhah : "What is that?"
>
> Umm Sulaim : "Suppose a person is entrusted with something. Should he restore on demand that which is entrusted to him or not?"

**Everyman's Talmud*, edited and translated by A. Cohen, E. P. Dutton, New York, 1949, p. 171.

Abu Talhah : "He must deliver up. He has no right to hold back."

Umm Sulaim : "Abu Umair was entrusted to us by Allah. He has taken him back."

When Abu Talhah began to weep, his wife said, "Then you must keep patience for your dead son!"*

Pious Jews sincerely believe that their holy books were divinely revealed. The first Five Books which contain the Mosaic Law are especially revered. In addition to the written Law recorded in the *Khumesh* or Five Books, Jews are taught to believe that the Prophet Moses (peace be upon him) received from God on Mount Sinai the oral Law as well. Both were intended to be complementary to each other. For centuries the oral Law of the Jews was kept alive in the memory of the priestly *Levites* and *Cohens* but after the destruction of the Second Temple in Jerusalem by the Romans in 70 A.D. and the wholesale dispersion of the Jews from Palestine, it was feared that the oral law would be lost forever unless also recorded in writing. Therefore the learned rabbis of that time lost no time codifying the oral Law into a book known as the *Mishnah*. Since the *Mishnah* was difficult for the average man to understand and obscure in parts, the rabbis compiled a voluminous commentary on it known as the *Gamarah*. The *Mishnah* and the *Gamarah* combined is the *Talmud*. Some parts of the Talmud were written in Palestine, but the Palestinian Talmud is regarded by the rabbis as an inferior work. The

**The Stories of Sahabah*, Maulana Muhammad Zakaria, Malik Brothers, Lahore, pp. 165-166; "Virtuous Women," *Yaqeen International*, Karachi, October 7 and 22, 1966, p. 69.

Talmud *magnum opus* was compiled by generations of rabbis in what is today Iraq between the 3rd and 5th centuries A.D. Until very recent times, this Iraqi Talmud was the supreme authority—the meat and drink of the entire Jewish diaspora. During this same period, in addition to the Talmud, a folk commentary upon the Bible was composed which is known as the *Midrash.* Although in exile, the Jews readily learned the local languages of the various lands of their dispersion, all their holy books were kept in the original Hebrew text. For this reason the Jews gave education top priority. Literacy in Hebrew was universal among Jewish men and boys. Girls received at best only an elementary schooling but from the age of four or five, boys were given the most rigorous training in learning the Hebrew language, the Bible and finally the Talmud which in its forty bulky volumes required a life-time of study. Like Arabic, Hebrew is written from right to left; also like Arabic, its alphabet includes only consonants with the vowels indicated by dashes and dots and above and below the letters. So similar is the vocabulary and grammatical structure of these closely-related Semitic languages, that one who knows Hebrew can very quickly and easily learn Arabic and *vice versa.* At first the concept of *Torah* was restricted to the first five books of Moses; later the entire Old Testament was included and finally the Talmud also became revered as divinely-inspired. The study of *Torah* was regarded by the pious Jews as the noblest of pursuits, encumbent upon all the males of the community. In the *ghetto* it was not wealth or social position that mattered but

knowledge of *Torah*. Here are some excerpts from *The Ethics of the Fathers* which reveals the very essence of Talmud:

Moses received the *Torah* at Sinai and handed it down to Joshua; Joshua to the elders; the elders to the prophets and the prophets handed it down to the rabbis of the Great Assembly. The latter said three things : Be patient in the administration of justice, develop many students and make a fence for the *Torah*.

Simon the Just was one of the last survivors of the Great Assembly. He used to say: The world is based on three principles—*Torah*, worship and kindliness.

Yose ben Yo'ezer of Zeredah and Yose ben Yohanan of Jerusalem received the oral tradition from the preceding. Yose ben Yo'ezer of Zeredah said : Let your house be a meeting place for scholars; sit at their feet in the dust and drink in their words thirstingly.

Hillel said : Be of the disciples of Aaron, loving peace and pursuing peace; be one who loves his fellow men and draws them near to the *Torah*.

He used to say : He who seeks greater reputation loses his reputation; he who does not increase his knowledge decreases it; he who does not study deserves death; he who makes unworthy use of the crown of learning shall perish.

He (Rabbi Hillel) used to say : If I am not for myself, who is for me? If I care for myself alone, what am I? If not now, when?

Shammai said : Make your study of *Torah* a regular habit; say little but do much and receive all men cheerfully.

Rabbi Gamaliel, the son of Rabbi Judah Ha-Nisai, said: It is well to combine *Torah* study with some worldly occupation for the energy taken up by both of them keeps sin out of mind; all *Torah* study which is not combined with some trade must at length fail and cause sin. Let all who work in the community do so for the sake of God; then the merit of their fathers will sustain them and their righteousness will

endure forever.

All Israel have a share in the world to become as it is said (in the Bible): "Your people shall all be righteous; they shall possess the land (of Palestine) forever; they are a plant of my own, the work of my hands wherein I may glory."

Rabbi Judah Ha-Nasai said: Consider three things and you will not fall into sin. Know what is above you—a seeing eye, a hearing ear and a Book in which all your deeds are recorded.

Hillel said: Never say: When I shall have leisure I shall study (*Torah*) for you may (die) and never have leisure.

He used to say: The more flesh, the more worms in the grave; the more property, the more anxiety; the more wives, the more witchcraft; the more female servants, the more lewdness; the more male servants, the more thievery; but the more *Torah* study, the more life; the more schooling, the more wisdom; the more counsel, the more understanding; the more righteousness, the more peace. One who has acquired a good name has acquired it for himself but one who has acquired for himself *Torah*, has acquired the life of the world to come.

Rabbi Yohanan ben Zakkai received the oral tradition from Hillel and Shammai. He used to say: If you have learnt much *Torah*, do not claim credit for yourself because God created you for this purpose.

Rabbi Joshua said: The evil eye of greed, the evil impulse and the hatred for mankind shorten a man's life.

Rabbi Yose said: Let your friends' property be as precious to you as your own; give yourself to studying *Torah* for it does not come to you by inheritance but through striving and let all your deeds be done in the name of God.

Rabbi Jacob said: This world is like a vestibule before the world to come. Prepare yourself in the vestibule so that you may enter the banquet hall.

Ben Azzal said : Do not despise any man and do not consider anything as impossible for there is not a man who has not his Hour and there is not a thing that has not its place.

Everything is foreseen by God, yet freewill is granted to man; the world is ruled by Divine goodness yet all is according to the amount of a man's work.

Rabbi Eleazar ben Azaryah said : Where there is no *Torah*, there is no proper conduct; where there is no proper conduct, there is no *Torah*. Where there is no wisdom, there is no reverence; where there is no reverence, there is no wisdom. Where there is no knowledge, there is no understanding; where there is no understanding, there is no knowledge. Where there is no bread, there is no *Torah* and where there is no *Torah*, there is no bread.

Rabbi Simeon said: If they have eaten at a table and have held no conversation on *Torah*, it is as though they had eaten of sacrifices offered to the dead idols, as it is said (in the Bible) that all their tables are full of filth without the presence of God. But if three have eaten at a table and have conversed on *Torah*, they are as though they have eaten from the table of God as it is said in the Bible that this is the table which is in the presence of the Lord.

Rabbi Eleazar said: Be eager to study the *Torah*; know what to answer an unbeliever; know before whom you toil, who your Employer is who will pay you the reward for your labour.

Rabbi Tarfon said: The day (life) is short; the task is great; the workmen (human beings) are lazy, the reward is great and the Master (God) is insistent. Your employer can be trusted to pay you for your work and know that the grant of reward to the righteous will be in the world to come.

Rabbi Hananyah be Akashyah said : The Holy One, blessed be He, desired to purify Israel; hence He gave them a *Torah* rich in rules of conduct. As is written in the Bible :

The Lord was pleased for the sake of Israel's righteousness to render the *Torah* great and glorious.*

These quotations from Talmud have been regarded for centuries by Jews as the summit of wisdom. Note the *isnad* and the striking similarity of the composition of this part of the Talmud to our Hadith literature. Since so much of the same material in the Torah, Talmud and *Midrash* is also found in our Holy Quran and Hadith, Jewish scholars contemptuously regard Islam as nothing but a distorted and defective version of Judaism mixed with the teachings of some heretical Christian sects and pagan Arab practices! When I was a student at New York University, one of my professors, who was also a rabbi, conducted a course in which I enrolled entitled "Judaism in Islam." Our textbook, written by him, consisted of taking the second and third *Surahs* which traced in the footnotes each of these Quranic verses to its allegedly Jewish source.**

Although the factual material contained in these books cannot be denied, the conclusions which Jewish scholars draw from them are so abhorrent to us, that no Muslim could possibly accept them. What is the Muslim answer to the challenge? The Muslim scholar must fearlessly explain to the Jewish scholar that the portions of our Holy Quran and Hadith which are also found in the Jewish holy books does not mean that the former merely

**Ha-Siddur Ha-Shem* (Daily Prayer Book), translated from the Hebrew original by Philip Birbaum, Hebrew Publishing Company, New York, 1949, pp. 473-534. (abridged).

**See *Judaism and the Koran*, Abraham Isaac Katsh, A. S. Barnes & Co., New York, 1954 and C. Torrey's *The Jewish Foundation of Islam*, New York, 1933.

borrowed from the latter, but that **originally both were Divine revelations.** God revealed it first to the the *Bani Israil* but when they corrupted God's word until the Divine could no longer be distinguished from its false human interpolations, God revealed this same material again to our Holy Prophet where only in the Quran and Hadith can it be found in its pristine purity.

Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) could not have received his knowledge about the earlier prophets in the previously revealed scriptures or from discussions and arguments with the rabbis of Medina. From the start, they most bitterly opposed his mission so that they never had the opportunity to assume the friendly role of teachers. Furthermore, the Torah and Talmud were not available in Arabic and our Holy Prophet knew no Hebrew. It was the Divine will that our Holy Prophet was unlettered as proof that he derived his wisdom direct from God and not from books.

> It was Ezra's firm conviction that what the Israelites needed most to preserve themselves as a religious entity and as a people was a body of scriptural writings which would best represent the Mosaic and prophetic works. In order not to allow later alteration and distortion of the sacred text, he wished to make it a final, closed canon. Accordingly, he surrounded himself with a learned company of priests and scribes or *Soferim* like himself. Among them were chroniclers, legal scholars, teachers of ethics and generally men who were familiar with all manner of Jewish sacred writings, traditions, religious rites and ceremonies. They helped Ezra compile and edit the Five Books of Moses. Collectively these compilers and editors

went under the name of the Men of the Great Assembly. Yet Ezra was not completely satisfied. *He wished to utilize the solemnity of the occasion* of the consecration of the completely codified Torah *for still another purpose—to preserve the purity of the stock*. He made the Israelites swear "that we will not give our daughters unto the people of the land nor take their daughters for our sons.*

Note here that **the first Five Books were not put into their final canonized form by Ezra until more than eight centuries after the death of Moses** (peace be upon him)! Under these circumstances, corruption of the text was inevitable. Not also that the final edition was admittedly written by the learned scribes. In our Holy Quran, God always speaks in the *first person*, which conclusively proves its Divine source. All the books of the Jewish Bible were composed by their scribes in the *third person* which is sufficient to betray their human origin. The anxiety of Ezra to "preserve the racial purity of the stock", which made him put a total ban on mixed marriages, must have temped him irresistibly to interpolate the sacred Text in order to serve the aims of Jewish nationalism. That is why Ezra ousted the Samaritans from the Jewish community as pariahs, though they professed implicit faith in the Torah, merely because they had been guilty of intermarriage with non-Jews. In the Talmud, we find the learned rabbis disputing over the uncertainty of the date, authorship and even at times doubting the authenticity of various books in the

**Pictorial History of the Jewish People*, Nathan Ausbel, Crown Publishers, New York, 1953, pp. 68-69.

Bible. Today the majority of Jews no longer accept their Torah as Divine Revelation. In the Government schools in modern "Israel", children are taught to regard it merely as history and literature.

Prayer is an essential a part of Jewish practice as in all other religions. Worship by prostration was well known to the *Bani Israil* as many passages of the Bible indicate. As late as the seeond century A.D., it must have been quite common among the Jews for it is written in the Talmud that Rabbi Akiba, one of the most esteemed sages of that time, at the beginning of his prayer was found in one corner of the synagogue and at the opposite at the end because of his incessant bowings and prostrations. Ablutions before prayers are also known to the Jews and the pious regard it as essential to have a ritual bath after intercourse, nocturnal emissions, menses and childbirth. It is written in the Bible that whenever Daniel prayed in his chamber, he always faced towards the direction of the Temple in Jerusalem This shows that the concept of the *Qiblah* was familiar to him. The dwindling band of Samaritan Jews, who now live in Nablus, worship in a very similar manner to the Muslims, always performing ablutions before praying three times daily; standing, kneeling and prostrating themselves on mats or carpets. They include some prayers in Arabic and such Muslim expressions a *la ilaha illa llah, la sharik lahu, Allah wahadahu, inshallah* and *Allah alim*, are common among them. Books written by Samaritans begin with *Bismillah-i-rahman-i-rahim*. However, the Samaritans who accept only the Mosaic Law as Divine revelation and reject all the other books of the Bible as well as the

Talmud, have for more than two thousand years been cast outside the main stream of Judaism. Even though some Jews, like the son of Maimonides, lamented the abandonment of the prostration in prayer and praised it as a perfect expression of utter human servitude to God, they have never been successful in persuading their community to readopt it. The reason for this is that Jews were determined at any cost to preserve intact their separate entity as a people and never be confused with the Muslims. That is why Jews always pray sitting on a chair or bench. In Orthodox synagogues of Eastern European origin, each worshipper recites his prayers individually while some of the men stroll up and down the aisles chatting with their friends. My great-grandfather was one of the respected elders of the synagogue and my father told me that he dimly remembers when a very small boy during a Sabbath service being urged to go up to the platform and "kiss grandpa." This gives an idea of the confusion and disorder which prevailed. Like Islam, the teachings of Judaism regard congregational prayer as far superior to prayers said individually. Like Islam, women are not obliged to attend owing to their household duties. Like Islam, the segregation of men and women in the Orthodox synagogue is strictly enforced for the same reasons. Also like the Muslim, the pious Jewish worshipper is enjoined to cover his head with a small black skull cap but shoes are not removed. Since the destruction of the Temple, priesthood has been abolished until such time as God wills that it be restored. The rabbi is not a priest in any sense of that term; he is a scholar

learned in the sacred Law who occupies in the Jewish community the same position as the *ulema* among us. Like Muslims, a Jew can offer his prayers at any time in any place direct to God without an intermediary. Because of his superior learning and prestige, the rabbi customarily conducts the synagogue service but if no rabbi is available, any sane, adult male familiar with the liturgy can take over. A Jewish congregation requires at least eleven or more grown men which is known as a *minyon*. The husband of one of my cousins now living in New York who was born into an Orthodox family of Eastern European origin, told me that when he was a boy of twelve staying at a summer resort near Canada, his father died of a heart-attack. He was so grief-stricken that although no rabbi or synagogue was available there, throughout his summer vacation, he and seven other boys banded together and every day recited the mourner's *Kaddish* for his father. When he returned to New York that autumn, he told the rabbi of his synagogue what he had done, expecting to receive high praise for his piety, but instead the rabbi harshly castigated him for doing such a thing before he had grown to mature manhood and since he did not have a *minyon* of eleven men, his prayers had been useless! So angry was the boy with the rabbi and disgusted with this rigid formalism, he told me, that he has never attended synagogue since!

After the destruction of the Temple, instrumental music was banned from the Orthodox synagogue service as pagan; the *chazzan* chants the Torah and the other liturgy very much like our *Qaris* recite

Holy Quran, only in contrast to the latter, the Jewish chants are the most mournful laments of a people in despair. Although Jewish prayers are full of the praise and glorification of God, they provide the student with an eloquent illustration how nationalism and racism have corrupted an originally Divinely-revealed faith. The following are excerpts from typical Jewish prayers :

> Guardian of Israel, preserve the remnant of Israel; let not Israel perish who say : "Hear Oh Israel!".... Guardian of a unique people, preserve the remnant of a unique people; let not a unique people perish who proclaim Thy Oneness, saying "The Lord our God, the Lord is One." Oh Thou Who art reconciled by supplications, be Thou reconciled to an afflicted generation, for there is none to help. Our Father, our King! Be gracious to us and answer us for we have no merits, deal charitably and kindly with us and save us. Oh mind not our former inquities; may Thy compassion hasten to our aid for we are brought very low. Take pity on us, Oh Lord, take pity on us for we are exceedingly sated with contempt. When in wrath, remember to be merciful....remembering that we are but dust. Help us, our saving God, for the sake of Thy glorious name; rescue us and pardon our sins for Thy name's sake.
>
> ....And now, Lord our God, Who hast brought Thy people out of the land of Egypt with a mighty hand and hast made for Thyself a name unto this day, we have sinned; we have acted wickedly. Oh Lord, in accordance with all Thy righteous deeds, pray, let Thy anger and Thy fury turn from Jerusalem, Thy city, Thy holy mountain (Zion) for through our sins and through the iniquities of our fathers, Thy people are held in disgrace by all who surround us. And now, our God, listen to Thy servant's prayer and supplications and let Thy favour shine upon Thy

desolate sanctuary for Thy own sake, Oh Lord! Lend Thy ear, our God and hear; open Thy eyes and see our ruins and the city which is called by Thy name. Our Father, our merciful Father, show us a sign for happiness and gather our dispersed from the four corners of the earth; let all the nations realize and know that Thou art the Lord, our God. Spare thy people, Oh Lord, and let not Thy heritage be an object of contempt, a by-word among the nations. Why should it be said among the peoples; "Where is their God? Oh gracious and merciful King, remember Thy Covenant with Abraham; let the attempted sacrifice of his only son, Isaac, appear before Thee for Israel's sake....In Thy great goodness, have compassion on us for we have no other God besides Thee. Our Rock, forsake us not....for we are exhausted from war and captivity, pestilence and plague and from every trouble and sorrow. Rescue us and put us not to shame.

There is none gracious and merciful like thee, Lord our God, there is none like Thee, a God slow to anger and rich in kindness and truth. Remember Thy servants, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; consider not our stubbornness, our wickedness and sinfulness. Change Thy mind about doing evil to Thy people and remove from us the scourge of death for Thou showeth undeserved kindness in every generation. Spare thy people, Oh Lord, and deliver us from Thy wrath; remove from us the scourge of plague and cruel persecution for Thou art the Guardian of Israel. How can we complain? How can we justify ourselves? Let us search and examine our ways and return to Thee for Thy right hand is stretched out to receive those who repent. Our Father, our King, though we be without righteousness and good deeds, remember in our favour the Covenant of our fathers and our daily testimony, "The Lord is One!" Look at our plight for our pangs and miseries of heart are numerous. Oh God, look! Our glory has waned among the nations; they utterly detest us. How long shall Thy

glory remain in captivity and Thy splendor in the hand of the foe? Arouse Thy might and Thy zeal against Thy enemies that they may be put to shame and crushed despite their power. Let not our sufferings seem trivial to Thee... Look down from heaven and see how we have become an object of contempt and derision among the nations; we are counted as sheep led to the slaughter-house to be slain and destroyed or to be beaten and disgraced. Strangers say to us, "There is no hope for you." Be gracious to a people that yearn for Thy name. Pure One, hasten our salvation; we are worn out and no rest is granted us. Leave us not in the power of our enemies to blot out our name. Remember that Thou hast sworn to our fathers: "I will make your descendants as numerous as the stars in the sky" and now we are left but a few out of many.

Through all generations we will declare Thy greatness; to all eternity we will proclaim Thy holiness. Thy praise, our God, shall never depart from our mouth and Thou art our great and holy God. Thou wilt set up a new altar in Zion; upon it we will offer new moon offerings and acceptable animal sacrifices. All of us will rejoice in the service of the sanctuary and in the psalms of Thy servant David which will be heard in Thy city and recited before Thy altar. Bring us to Zion, to Jerusalem, Thy sanctuary with everlasting joy....Be pleased, Lord our God with Thy people, Israel and with their prayer; restore the worship of Thy most holy sanctuary and accept Israel's offering and prayer with gracious love. May the worship of Thy people, Israel, be for ever pleasing to Thee. May our eyes behold Thy return in mercy to Zion. Blessed art Thou, Oh Lord Who restoreth Thy Divine presence to Zion.

Oh our God and God of our Fathers, answer our entreaty....Rebuild Thy Temple as of yore and set up Thy sanctuary on its site. Grant that we may see it rebuilt, gladdened by its restoration. Restore the

*Kohanim* (priests) to their service, the *Levites* to their song and music and the Israelites to their homeland. There we will go up to present ourselves and worship before Thee at our three pilgrim seasons as it is written in Thy *Torah* ; "Three times a year shall all your males appear before the Lord, your God in the place He will choose; on the Feast of unleavened Bread, on the Feast of the Weeks and on the Feast of the Tabernacles and they shall not appear before the Lord empty-handed. Every man shall offer what he can afford as the Lord, your God has blessed...."

We hope, therefore, Lord our God, soon to behold Thy majestic glory, when the abominations shall be removed from the earth and the false gods exterminated; when the world shall be perfected under the reign of the Almighty and all mankind will call upon Thy name and the wicked of the earth will be turned to Thee. May all the inhabitants of the world realize and know that to Thee every knee must bend and every tongue must vow allegiance. May they bend the knee and prostrate themselves before Thee, Lord our God, and give honour to Thy glorious name; may they all accept the yoke of Thy kingdom and do Thou reign over them speedily for ever and ever....*

This is the essence of Judaism. The constant reference to Palestine as God's gift to the Jews and particularly the supplication for the restoration of the Temple on the same site as the two previously destroyed, is tantamount to a declaration of war against Islam. On this very spot, stands our *Masjid Aqsa* which, after the *Kaaba* and the Prophet's Mosque in Medina, is our most sacred shrine. Not only that, but the very rock where our Holy Prophet's *Miraj* (ascension

*Quoted from *Ha-Siddur Ha-Salem* (Daily Prayer Book) op. cit.

to heaven) took place is claimed by Jewish tradition to be exactly where the Ark, their Holy of Holies, stood. Now that after two thousand years this is once again in Jewish hands, unless we can defeat them in *Jihad*, our *Masjid Aqsa* cannot be liberated as they would never relinquish it to us peacefully. Not only the *Masjid Aqsa* but the tombs of the other prophets and patriarchs in Palestine are as sacred to Muslims as to the Jews and Christians, and since all of these have fallen into Jewish hands since June 5-9, 1967, Muslims are not permitted access to them. This is intolerable. Under such circumstances, unless both Jews and Muslims become totally indifferent to their respective faiths, which is highly unlikely, sooner or later, violent conflict is inevitable.

Note especially in these Jewish prayers, how conspicuous is the Hereafter by its absence! In these lengthy, interminable supplications, one only occasionally comes across a vague reference to the "world to come." In the prayer for the martyrs, we find a reference to their immortal souls but except in the burial service, the Day of Resurrection and Judgment Day rarely appear. In the daily prayer book, there is hardly any mention of Hell at all, although we do find it occasionally referred to in the Talmud. One searches the verbose narrations in the Old Testament in vain for any clear-cut, unambiguous reference to the Day of Judgment and reward or punishment in the Hereafter. The biblical prophets threaten *Bani Israil* because of their sins with divine punishment by defeat, destruction of their property, persecution and exile at the hands of their

enemies, *but no mention is ever made that they will be condemned by God on the Day of Judgment and be doomed to Hell-fire.* The story of Job in the Bible is typical. God afflicts Job with the death of all his family, the destruction of his home and all his property and being struck down by painful and loathsome disease which was all intended to be a test for the steadfastness of his faith. Despite all these calamities and despite his complaints and lamentations, Job retains his faith intact in the goodness of God and as reward for this, his family, property and health are fully restored. *But note that nothing whatever is mentioned concerning his reward in the Hereafter.* Those portions of the Talmud already quoted, in contrast to the Old Testament, do testify to the fact that the concept of reward and punishment in the Hereafter was familiar to the Jews by that time, but its effectiveness as the sanction and only valid motive behind the moral law is completely nullified by the ever-recurring phrase: "*All of Israel has a share in the world to come.*" This implies that the Jew by birth will attain salvation, no matter what he believes or what he does. In all of the Jewish holy books, the Hereafter is subordinated to a relatively insignificant role, completely overshadowed by the prominence given to the necessity for the restoration of Palestine. The Jew prays only for the collective prosperity of his people in this world. Our Holy Quran says of the Jews that they are the greediest of all peoples for life and that each of them would like to live a thousand years but even if this were granted, it would not save them from the doom of Hell. The Jewish prayer for the sick man is sufficient proof of the truth of this statement.

Oh Lord, punish me not in Thy anger; chastise me not with Thy wrath. Have pity on me, oh Lord, for I languish away; heal me, oh Lord, for my health is shaken. My soul is severely troubled; and oh Lord, how long? *Oh Lord, deliver my life once again;* save me because of Thy grace. *For in death there is no thought of Thee; in the grave who gives thanks to Thee?* I am worn out with my groaning; every night I flood my bed with tears; I cause my couch to melt with my weeping. Mine eye is dimmed from grief; it grows old because of my foes. Depart from me, all ye evil-doers for the Lord has heard the sound of my weeping. The Lord has heard my supplications; the Lord receives my prayer. All my foes shall be utterly terrified; they shall turn back; they shall be utterly ashamed....*

What evidence than this prayer could be more conclusive to show how the Jews have corrupted the message of the prophets and distorted their scriptures to serve the ends of Jewish nationalism? What could be a more glaring illustration of the spiritual impoverishment of Judaism? The man reciting this prayer may be on his death-bed, but still he can think only of his welfare and comfort in this world. It would never occur to him to keep patience and pray as the Muslim would certainly do in this place:

Our Lord! Grant us the good of this world and the good of the Hereafter and save us from the torment of Hell-fire! (Quran 2 : 201)

Mind it not! It (the sickness) is but a purger (of sins) if God, the most High wills. (Hadith)

Oh God! Suffer me to live as long as life is better for me and cause me to die when death is better for me. (Hadith)

In the name of God, the Greatest. I seek refuge from the evil of every spurting vein and from the evil of Hell-fire! (Hadith)

**Ha-Siddur Ha-Salem,* op. cit.. p. 754.

The ceremonies of Orthodox Jews at death bear a striking similarity with the funeral rites of the Muslims.

Members of the most important society in the *shtetl*, the *Khevreh Kadisha*, take care of the last ritual. The dying person must repeat the final confession of (his faith) as it is read to him. If he is unable to speak for himself, a member of the burial society will recite it for him. This service will be performed for women by elderly matrons who belong to the *Khevreh Kadisha* and whose duty also is to sew the shroud in which the corpse will be wrapped. When death actually arrives, the first exclamation of those who are present or those who hear about it will be, "Blessed be the true Judge!" Even the ones most deeply bereaved will utter this acceptance of the decree they have striven so passionately to avert. The Jew knows that the Lord has decided to take the sick man's soul. He mourns very deeply but he submits himself to the will of God. While the corpse is still in the house, it lies on the floor with a candle at the head and the feet toward the door. The corpse is prepared for the funeral by being washed, purified and wrapped in the shroud prepared by the members, of the *Khevreh Kadisha*. A man is dressed in his festive white *Kittl* and covered with his prayer shawl. Men may be washed and purified by either men or women; women only by members of their own sex. Just as finger nails or blood become unclean or dangerous once they have left the living body, so the body itself becomes evil once life has left it. *Within twenty-four hours the corpse must be cleaned, purified and buried.* The body is buried uncoffined but the walls of the grave are boxed with boards. After the grave has been covered with earth, the nearest male relative—son, brother or husband—says *Kaddish*, the prayer for the dead. One of the most important *mitsvos* is to accompany the dead. As many people accompany the dead body, so many angels will greet the soul. Therefore

it is a duty to go to a funeral. Absence from a funeral is a sin and also a direct insult to the departed; an insult for which there will never be an opportunity to ask forgiveness.*

The attitude of Jews towards death. however, contrasts markedly with that of the pious Muslim. Even the most pious Jews are terrified by the thought of death which they will go to almost any lengths to avoid, while the Muslim strong in faith accepts death as an inevitable part of life that can only occur by God's decree which is final and inescapable. In contrast to the Muslim who accepts his death and that of his loved ones with serene resignation, death is regarded by Jews as the greatest of all evils, even though Jews have contributed many martyrs in defence of their religious identity.

> To the Jew God's highest gift to man is life and to cling to this gift is a primary obligation. Man has been given life by God and he has to keep it. The Jews regard the worst life as better than the best death. Even the words for death or dying are avoided in everyday language by means of countless euphemisms, for one who mentions death is not sure of his life. As long as a person is alive, hope will not be abandoned and the community as well as the family is mobilized to fight death. Prayers, alms-giving, and changing of names are used in addition to medical treatments and drugs. When the end seems almost inevitable, extreme measures are taken; running to the graves of the ancestors, weeping and screaming in front of the Ark in *shul* (synagogue) to "cry out" the dying from death.**

This morbid horror of death is proof that the concept of Hereafter is not a convincing reality to the Jewish community.

**Life is with the People: the Culture of the Shtetl,* op. cit., pp. 377-379.

***Ibid.*, pp. 376-377.

In the second *Surah* of our Holy Quran, God revealed to our Prophet that fasting is prescribed for us as it was prescribed for those before us. Fasting is an established mode of worship among all the religions of the world and Judaism is no exception. The most solemn of all the days in the Jewish calendar is *Yom Kippur* (the Day of Atonement) which is characterized by a twenty-four hour fast lasting from the sundown of that day until the sunset of the next. *Yom Kippur* services in the synagogue last the entire day where the worshippers repent of their sins and beg God for forgiveness. Some pious Jews also fast on the 9th of the Jewish month of *Ab* which is the anniversary of the destruction of the Second Temple by the Romans in 70 A.D. and since then, this day has been observed as an occasion for mourning, fasting and supplication to God to restore the Temple and spare the Jews from extinction. Thus it can be seen that the Jewish concept of fasting is for penance and mourning. In Islam there is no fasting for mourning or penance except as an expiation for a few definitely named sins in the Quran like killing a believer by mistake or by divorcing a wife by likening her back to the back of her mother. The main purpose of the obligatory fast of Ramadan is to strengthen the character and will-power to resist evil temptations and also to subordinate the requirements of the body to the welfare of the soul in order that mankind may rise from an animal-like existence to realize his fullest potentialities as the vicegerent of God on earth. All of these precepts are completely lacking in the Jewish concept of fasting. Likewise, it is alien to Islamic

teachings to set aside only one day for fasting and repentance which is very likely to be interpreted that one is free to commit sins all the other days of the year! Islam checks this evil by ordaining that one must seek repentance for one's sins in every prayer five times daily and beg the forgiveness of God any time of the day or night. Most Jews consider it obligatory to fast only one day of the year—on *Yom Kippur.* Islamic teachings would deny that a single day of fasting could possibly be effective and thus the entire month of Ramadan is prescribed for us.

Like Islam charity is also enjoined by Judaism. The Hebrew word for almsgiving is *Tzedakah* (note the similarity to the corresponding term in Arabic) which literally means "righteousness." Even the present version of the Mosaic law prescribes as obligatory for all *Bani Israil* who can afford it to offer as charity to the needy one-tenth of the value of the produce from the harvest and also enjoins that the corners of the fields remain unharvested as gleanings for the poor. The Talmud does teach that assisting the poor is not an act of grace on the part of the donor but a duty. By giving alms, he is merely practicing righteousness and performing a deed of justice. All of a man's possessions, including even his own body, are but a loan from the Creator of the Universe and since all belongs to God, a man's charity merely secures a more equitable distribution of God's gifts. The Talmud records a most revealing conversation which took place between Rabbi Akiba and the Roman Governor of Palestine, Tineius Rufus. The latter asked the former: "If your God loves the poor, why does He not provide

for them? Rabbi Akiba replied, "So that we may be delivered through them from the doom of *Gehinnom* (Hell)." But the Roman argued, "On the contrary, that should certainly incur God's wrath and the penalty of *Gehinnom.* I will give you a parable. To what is charity to the poor like? To a human king who was angry with his slave, imprisoned him and ordered that he was not to be fed and then somebody goes and feeds him and gives him water. When the king hears, will he not be furious?" Akiba replied, "I will give you another parable. To what is charity to the poor like? To a human king who was angry with his son, imprisoned him and ordered that he was not to be provided with food or drink and then somebody goes and gives him food and water. When the king learns about this, will he not reward him and send him a present and forgive his son for, as the Bible says, 'We are all the children of God.' Rabbi Akiba would have been shocked and dismayed indeed by what took place on the part of the Jews of Medina centuries later. When after our Holy Prophet sent a letter to the Jewish tribe of Banu Qainuqa urging them to accept Islam, to establish regular worship and to pay their *Zakat* to the poor, one of them, Pinhas bin Azura, replied cynically to Hazrat Abu Bakr : "Then your God is certainly poor if He must beg for a loan from us!" How eloquently this illustrates the blasphemy of the Jews and their revolt against God's teachings, even as they appear in their own holy books!

The Jews must be given their credit where it is due for they no doubt are the most generous philan-

thropists the world has ever known. Even while they were segregated in the *ghettos* in Europe and the *mellahs* in the Arab world, the Jewish community was superbly organized to take care of its poor, sick and disabled. It must be admitted that the Jewish community takes charge of its helpless members while we Muslims, even though ordained by Islamic teachings to do so, have failed. Jewish communities, wherever they are to be found, car boast of a complete network of orphanages, old-age homes for those unfortunates who have outlived their families, hospitals, mental hospitals and sheltered workshops for the mentally and physically handicapped, where an attempt is made to rehabilitate them as far as possible for normal life and employment. *The Federation of Jewish Philanthropies* in New York City provides every kind of social service and helps non-Jews as well. To our shame, we must admit that nothing like this exists in the Muslim world today. Furthermore, in the Zionist fund-raising drives for "Israel", almost every one of the five million Jews in America and many non-Jews enthusiastically pour out the contents of their purses and the money flows like water ! During the recent Israeli invasion of June 5-9, 1967, the Zionists were able to raise hundreds of thousands of dollars in America within less than a week ! If somebody here in Pakistan tried to organize a fund-raising drive for *Jihad* in Palestine, how many Muslims, even in oil-rich Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, would contribue ? The obvious answer to our shame and dishonour offers at least a partial explanation why Zionism has been so successful at our expense !

Jews who contribute to philanthropic causes do

so either for humanitarian altruism or for worldly considerations. Our Holy Quran and Hadith teach us that charity or any other pious act must be done with the sole intention to please Almighty Allah and if motivated for the sake of fame or some worldly recompense, no reward shall be granted in the Hereafter. Islam places great stress on the doing of good to please Allah alone and for the expectation of His favours in the Hereafter. *In Judaism, this vital precept is almost entirely absent.* Thus in the eyes of God, their philanthropic generosity is devoid of any spiritual value.

The prohibition of *Riba* (interest on capital) is well-known to Judaism as one of the rabbis in the Talmud said: "He who lends money at interest denies God; he makes the Torah a laughing-stock and Moses (peace be upon him) a fool !" But the whole value of this prohibition is nullified when again in their delusion that *Bani Israil* was God's special chosen people, the Mosaic Law was deliberately changed to allow Jews to charge interest in their transactions with non-Jews.

> "Thou shalt not lend upon interest to thy brother; interest of money, interest of victuals, interest of anything that is lent upon interest. *Unto a foreigner thou mayest lend upon interest but unto thy brother thou shalt not lend upon interest* so that the Lord thy God may bless thee in all thou puttest thy hand unto in the land wither thou goest in to possess it. (Deuteronomy 23: 20-21).

This makes the Jews free to prey upon non-Jews as they please with the alleged divine sanction of their Scripture ! It implies a double-standard of morality—one for Jews and the other for non-Jews ! As a result,

the Jews became the most notorious moneylenders and merciless usurers of Europe down to modern times. Jews will immediately plead their innocence to this charge and argue that the tyranny of the Church was responsible which forbade them to engage in any other means of livelihood. The Godfearing Muslim (who knows that Quran forbids *Riba* to all, regardless of circumstances) would prefer to starve to death than indulge in such a degrading occupation. The permission Jews gave to themselves by interpolating their scriptures in order to allow them to take interest from non-Jews, makes a mockery of all their platitudes of benevolence.

Judaism has no counterpart to our annual *Haj*. Although Jews do go to Jerusalem to pray before the Wailing Wall and visit other sacred places in the Holy Land for their historical and religious associations, these pilgrimages are not an organized institution and are always undertaken individually. In antiquity, the Temple was their holy of holies to such an extent that any non-Jew found within its precincts was at once condemned to death. The Jewish scholar contemptuously regards *Haj* as our Holy Prophet's concession to Arab paganism ! However, the true significance of the transfer of the *Qiblah* from the site of the old Temple in Jerusalem to the *Kaaba* in Mecca is given by a modern Quranic commentator as follows:

> The change of *qiblah* from the Temple to the *Kaaba* was an indication that the Israelites had been deposed from leadership and the Muslims had been appointed instead. Therefore the change of *qiblah* from the Temple to the *Kaaba* was not merely a change of direction....but

it was really the formal declaration of the change of leadership from the Israelites to the followers of Muhammad (God's peace be upon him.)....The change of *qiblah* also served to separate the believers from the slaves of prejudice and racialism. On the one side, there were the Arabs who were not ready to give up their own *Kaaba* and to adopt the Temple at Jerusalem as *qiblah.* They were tried first. It was a hard test but the sincere believers passed successfully through this and the worshippers of the idol of nationalism failed. Now when the *qiblah* was changed from Jerusalem to the *Kaaba,* those Jews and Christians who had embraced Islam were put to the test. It was very difficult for them to accept any other *qiblah* than the one of their forefathers. Thus the worshippers of race were separated from the worshippers of God and finally only the worshippers of Allah remained with the Holy Prophet.*

Even though it was common knowledge among Jews, Christians and pagans alike in Arabia at the time that the *Kaaba* had been founded in Mecca by the Prophet Abraham (peace be upon him), this change of *Qiblah,* striking as it did at the root of Jewish nationalism, enraged the *Bani Israil.* Even the most hostile Jewish and Christian orientalists in their writings describe the *Haj* as the most powerful institution for international human brotherhood and solidarity ever known. The *Haj* is the universality of Islam in practice. What a contrast to the moribund, parochial racism of Judaism!

In the remote antiquity of Old Testament times after the death of Moses (peace be upon him), the Jews were an aggressive and warlike people. If I may not

**The Meaning of the Quran* (commentary on Surah al-Baqarah), Maulana Sayyid Abul Ala Maudoodi, Islamic Publications, Lahore, 1967, pp. 109-110.

be accused as being too cynical, the God of Israel much resembles a real-estate agent! According to the present versions of the Old Testament, Palestine is God's promised land to the Jews, so much so that many Christians feel this is true! Many pages in the Old Testament describe in great detail the fierce battles the *Bani Israil* waged with hostile pagan tribes for the possession of their "Promised Land." Jews and most Christains also are convinced that this protracted struggle for Palestine was a Holy War and all the ruthless cruelties and atrocities of these battles were committed with the divine sanction of their interpolated scriptures:

> When thou comest nigh unto a city to fight against it, then proclaim peace unto it. And it shall be if it make thee answer of peace and open unto thee, then it shall be that all the people that are found therein shall be tributaries unto thee and they shall serve thee. And if it will make no peace with thee but will make war against thee, then thou shalt besieg it. And when the Lord, thy God hath delivered it into thine hands, thou shalt smite every male thereof with the edge of the sword but the women and the little ones and the cattle and all that is in the city, even all the spoil thereof, thou shalt take unto thyself and thou shalt eat the spoil of thine enemies which the Lord thy God hath given thee. Thus shalt thou do unto all the cities which are very far off from thee which are not the cities of these nations but of the cities of these people which the Lord thy God doth give thee for an inheritance, *thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth but thou shalt utterly destroy them; namely the Hittites, and the Amorites and the Perizites and the Hivites and the Jubusites as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee* that they teach you not to do after all their abominations which they have done unto their gods so should ye sin

against the Lord your God. (*Deuteronomy* 2 0: 10-18)

Now true enough, the struggles, related in the biblical books of Joshua, Judges and Kings are far from wars of nationalism and patriotism pure and simple. It is a fact that the tribes with whom the Israelites fought were all pagan idolaters whom their leadership constantly feared would corrupt the pure ethical monotheism of God's chosen people. Certainly the Mosaic law banning intermarriage was valid on these grounds. The Israelites of Old Testament days no doubt sincerely believed that upon their survival as a people possessing their own theocratic, sovereign state in Palestine depended the very existence of the true faith in One God to the exclusion of all other gods and implicit, unquestioning obedience to His divine laws. At this stage, the reader may wonder what distinguishes the Israelite struggle for Palestine as related in the Bible from the *Jihad* of Islam? The most conspicuous difference is that then, as much as now, *Judaism was a closed society*. Then as much as now, Judaism was a tribal religion where non-Israelites were on no account welcomed. It never occurred to the prophets, judges and kings of the Old Testament to propagate their faith to any of the pagans with whom they waged such fierce warfare. No Hittite or Amorite could save himself from divine wrath by denouncing paganism and proclaiming his faith in the one God for He was not their God but only the God of Israel! Thus the Israelites with the alleged divine sanction of their interpolated scriptures, could commit *genocide* with a clear conscience! Today in Zionist-occupied Palestine, history appears to be repeating

itself. In glaring contrast to the Christians, the Jews have no missionaries to send out to Muslim lands. Although some Jews are known to have embraced Islam, **I have never heard of a single case of a Muslim who has become a Jew! Thus it is clear that Judaism does not present the slightest ideological threat to the Muslims.** Jews, therefore, make no attempt to convert the Muslim and Christian Arabs in occupied Palestine; **they simply exterminate them.** In this respect, Zionism is far worse than the former imperialism of England or France. The British and French imperialisms were content merely to rule over their possessions in Asia and Africa; colonization was limited and in most cases practically non-existent. As much as the British and French imperialists strived to impose Westernization upon their colonial possessions and destroy the indigenous cultures, at least the native populations were left intact so that eventually when political fortunes changed, they could regain their sovereignty. Zionism tells a very different story. As the Hindus of India will tolerate only Hindus, "Israel" is for Jews only. Wherever Zionism rules, all non-Jews—Christians and Muslims alike—are driven out *en masse* by force. Those Arabs in occupied Palestine, who have managed to escape massacre and exile, are suffering the most miserable plight, completely cut off from their brethren in neighboring lands and without any legal rights or protection whatsoever. The policy of Zionism demands unlimited Jewish immigration and colonization for the deliberate purpose of overwhelming the indigenous population, the massacre or exile of most

of the non-Jews, the confiscation of all their lands and property and the total and permanent eradication of the Arab and Islamic character of Palestine. Zionism is not content, as are the other imperialisms, with the cultural extermination of the Muslims; it is embarked upon a campaign for our physical annihilation as well!

Since Talmudic times until the rise of modern Zionism, the Jews repudiated all their former warlike activities and became the champions of pacifism. The *Ghetto* Jews of medieval days abhorred any kind of violence, so much so that even when they were suffering the most severe persecution and attacked by Christian fanatics, they refused to defend themselves with weapons and would merely hide from their murderers cowering with fear. During this period, the concept of *Kiddush Ha-Shem*, which literally means, "The Sanctification of the Name of God" attained its most complete development. In its broadest sense, *Kiddush Ha-Shem* implies the utmost striving for a Jew in the cause of God which culmintates in martyrdom. Thus *Kiddush Ha-Shem* is roughly the Jewish equivalent of *Jihad*. However, the manifestations of the two are quite different. Under normal circumstances, Jewish teachings condemn the practice of suicide as does Christianity and Islam. But in time of dire calamity when the preservation of life would inevitably result in the forced repudiation of Judaism or some other grave sin, then suicide is praised by the pious Jew as the supreme virtue. Scholem Asch, the late Yiddish novelist, has given in his stories some of the most vivid examples of *Kiddush Ha-Shem*. One of his novels

entitled *Kiddush Ha-Shem*, is a lurid description of the wholesale massacre of the Jews in Poland by the Cossacks in 1648. When one of the Jewish towns in Poland was threatened by the Cossacks, no violent resistance or even defence was attempted. Instead, when their day of doom arrived, the entire Jewish community—men, women and children—gathered together in an open field, where the women first slaughtered their children, then the husbands their beloved wives and finally the men, wrapped in their burial shrouds and their prayer shawls, ecstatically singing hymns and chanting prayers, let themselves be slain by the Cossack hordes and the land filled with their corpses. In his book, *Tales of My People*, (Putnam, New York, 1948) which deals with the persecution by the Nazis during World War II, Scholem Asch gives a typical example of *Kiddush Ha-Shem* in recent times. The setting of the story* is a Jewish school for young girls in Warsaw under Nazi occupation. Some Nazi soldiers break into the school and demand the head-mistress to turn the place into a brothel and her students into prostitutes for their use or else face immediate death. The head-mistress, pretending to comply with this request, assures the Nazi soldiers that all would be ready for them within a few days. As soon as the soldiers leave, the head-mistress summons all the girls and tells them that since escape is impossible, it is their sacred duty to sanctify the Name of God by committing ritual suicide. She instructs the older pupils to help dress the younger ones

* "A Child Leads the Way," *Tales of My People*, Scholem Asch, G. P. Putnams Sons, New York, 1948, pp. 193-202.

in their burial shrouds and that night they all go into their classroom to find at each place on their desks, a portion of poisonous white powder. After reciting the appropriate prayers for *Kiddush Ha-Shem,* the headmistress swallows the poison followed by all the students, and thus they die, as their forebearers have done, assured that this deed makes them God's elect.

Thus it can be seen how different is the spirit of *Kiddush Ha-Shem* from the Islamic concept of *Jihad.* The former is passive while the latter is active. Had the characters in these stories been Muslims, suicide would be unthinkable. All would have **fought to defend themselves** to the death, however hopeless the odds. Non-violent means contain a strong element of self-destruction utterly abhorrent to Islamic teachings. Islam does not regard pacifism in itself as any virtue. In fact, non-resistance against evil and injustice is a great sin. Our Holy Quran exhorts the persecuted and oppressed to rise up and defend themselves so that the evil may be crushed. To fail to defend oneself when one is wronged, is incompatible with human dignity. With the rise of modern Zionism, the Jewish leaders began to recognize this truth. One of the foremost Hebrew poets of modern times, Chaim Nachman Bialik (1873-1934), exhorts with all the fervor of his emotionalism, his fellow Jews to organize resistance to defend themselves against the pogroms in Russia and Poland and not hesitate to extract full revenge upon their enemies if they were to survive. In the spring of 1943 during World War II, when threatened with extermination by the Nazis, the Jews of the Warsaw Ghetto offered

the most heroic resistance against hopeless odds. To give Zionism credit where it is due, there is no doubt that in "Israel," the Jews have proved themselves first-class soldiers. Zionism has proved that Arab nationalism is no match for Jewish nationalism. Arab nationalism is but an artificial slogan, utterly meaningless to the overwhelming majority of the Arab people. Jews will readily fight to the death for nationalism and patriotism but Arabs will not. In Judaism, religion is so closely intertwined with nationalism, it is almost impossible to separate the two. The concept of nationalism is the very negation of the universality of Islam. If warfare is waged by Muslims under any other banner than Islam, their morale is destroyed. This is not so in the case of the Jews since nationalism has always been an integral part of their faith. In Bible times, the *Bani Israil* fought both for religion and for patriotism. Since the rise of modern Zionism, the religious motive has greatly weakened. Thus the modern Jew in "Israel", who is often an atheist, fights for pure patriotism. Not until Jewish nationalism is pitted not against Arab nationalism but against a genuine *Jihad* can Zionism be permanently crushed. The practical value of *Jihad* is vividly illustrated in the following episode:

> A great Arab officer whose acquaintance I made at the front during the first Palestine war (1948) and whose courage in battle I witnessed until treachery caused him to fall into the hands of the Jews, told me later of his conversation with the commander of the Jewish army who had invited him to his office shortly before his release from the prisoner-of-war camp.

"Would you permit me to ask about a matter for which I as a soldier could find no satisfactory tactical explanation in the course of military operations?"

"Please do. Perhaps I will be able to answer you."

"Why did you not attack the Arab village of Sur Bahir near Jerusalem?"

The Jewish commander thought for a while and then said :

"A very good question. Do you want a frank answer?"

"Of course, if that is possible."

"The Israeli army did not attack Sur Bahir because it contained a large force of volunteers from *al-Ikhwan al-Muslimun.*"

"The captive officer, visibly offended, thought that the Jewish commander meant to belittle the value of the regular army since he spoke of the volunteers in such high terms. So he asked sharply, almost angrily, "What difference does that make? You often attacked other Arab positions defended by much larger and better equipped forces under conditions far more difficult for you!"

"The fact is that the volunteers of *al-Ikhwan al-Muslimun* are entirely different from your regular troops. For them fighting is not a duty which they fulfil within the bonds of tactics and of formal orders received but a passion to which they devote themselves with wholehearted enthusiasm. In this respect they are similar to our own soldiers who are fighting for the sake of Israel. But the difference between us and them is that we are fighting to build a national state to live in whereas **they want to die!** To attack people who are not only unafraid of death but actually aspire to die, with an enthusiasm bordering on madness as if they were savage demons out to challenge our civilization and all it stands for, is like attacking a thicket full of wild beasts. It is a risk we prefer to avoid. We do not think it wise to arouse these fanatics lest their lunacy infects all the others so that they gain all they want while we lose everything."

"What do you think it is that has afflicted these people so that they are infatuated with death and have become transformed into a demonic force which defies all reason?"

The Jewish commander replied: "The magic effect of religion on the minds of these simple-minded people! Unlike you, they have not had the opportunity of a progressive and enlightened education to open their eyes to the facts of life and to liberate them from superstition and the tricks of the merchants of religion. The poor wretches are still prey to those fantastic delusions about a paradise awaiting them after death overflowing with milk and honey. They are the chief obstacle in the way of a constructive peace for the sake of which we must cooperate and the greatest danger for the success of efforts made in good-will for the prevention of war and the establishment of relations on an enlightened basis between persons such as you and myself. They represent a danger not only to us but also to you if you genuinely want stability in your countries and your governments to be free of those disorderly elements which are constantly crying out for *Jihad* and martyrdom which have no place in the twentieth century. This is the century of science, of the United Nations, of world public opinion and the rights of man! I am so delighted to have met you and to have had this honest talk with you and I do not doubt that we will both remember it until we meet again under happier circumstances and in a different atmosphere filled with mutual cooperation which we hope will be achieved by enlightened progressives like yourself, free of all irrational rancour and obstinacy."

"As I left his office," he told me, "I felt as if a volcano were erupting inside my soul, as if my breast were on fire. By God, I had been so preoccupied with the different types of weapons and tactics in battle that I had ignored the most effective weapon in the most dangerous kind of battle. Now I have realized that **only the force of faith can repel this aggression!** Those who equip themselves with modern weapons and the materialist ideologies of the twentieth

century can be defeated only by those who hold fast to their faith in God and are determined to fight the enemies of God whatever disguise he may assume. They will induce awe and terror in the enemy so that he will fear them as he would fear a thicket of wild beasts. He will fear too that they will infect the rest of their people so that from them will burst forth volcanoes of faith which engulfed the treacherous ancestors of the present-day Jews—the Banu Qurayza, the Banu Nadir and the Banu Qaynuqa and then chastised them with implacable wrath at the Battle of Khaybar. Then I was overwhelmed by memories of the countenances of "these savage demons" in death, radiant with the smile of contentment, satisfaction and profound tranquillity."*

Judaism is in wholehearted agreement with Islam that God is not only the Creator and Sustainer of the universe, its living creatures and all mankind but the source of the moral law as well. Thus God does not only demand from His followers devout worship but implicit, unquestioning *obedience* to His Divine, unchangeable Law, which permeates every aspect of life from birth to death. As much as the devout Muslim, the pious Jew regards his faith as a complete way of life. As much as the Muslim, the Jew is convinced that love and devotion to God must be expressed by the strictest obedience to all His divine commandments and the utter submission to His will through the following of His Guidance as indispensable to attaining morality and spirituality in their highest sense. The striking similarities, as well as the differences, between Muslim and Jewish dietary laws are illustrated in the

* "A Lesson from the Battlefield," Dr. Said Ramadan, *The Muslim : Journal of the Muslim Students Association of the United Kingdom and Eire*, London, March 1969, pp. 124-125.

fact that the pious Jew, like the Muslim, makes a careful distinction between lawful and unlawful foods, convinced that what he eats will affect him morally and spiritually as well as physically :

> Everyone in the *Shtetl* knows, of course, that one must eat only food that is *kosher* (meaning literally "clean" in Hebrew) or ritually fit and that food which is *treyf* or ritually unfit must be rejected. Men, women and children know that in order to be *kosher*, food must be of the right kind, be prepared in the right way and be uncontaminated by any substance or circumstance that could make it unfit. They are most commonly concerned with the laws of *Kashrus* in connection with animal foods although some vegetable foods are forbidden—for instance, untithed grain, cross-bred grain and the fruit of a tree that has been bearing for less than three years. Everyone is familiar with the foods that are permitted; quadrupeds that both ruminate and have cloven hoofs, birds that do not eat carrion and fish with scales. All other animals are ruled inedible as are their milk and eggs. This excludes carnivores, rodents, shellfish, birds of prey, eaters of carrion and reptiles. Probably the peasants know as well as the Jews that **pork and its derivatives are forbidden** for this prohibition is the most conspicuous one in Eastern Europe where the pig furnishes the major source of meat to the majority of those who are not Jewish. Any child knows that in order to be *kosher*, the "permitted" animals must be killed in a way that causes a minimum of pain and this is the explanation for the rules about slaughtering for food. Hunting is forbidden since it may inflict death in a cruel way. The *shokhet's* blade must be so keen that there is no brutal tearing of flesh or skin but only one swift, almost painless stroke which must serve both trachea and jugular vein. The constant inspection of the rabbi that enforces this ruling serves as a reminder that although human welfare requires the killing of animals, it must be

done with as little suffering as possible. In contrast to this picture of the slaughter as surgery, the *shtetl* views with horror the methods of the peasants. "How they slaughter pigs! I saw it once and wouldn't want ever to see it again. It's horrible. The man sits on the pig's back and plunges the knife in again and again. And the pig yells. It was just horrible...." A little girl knows as well as her brother that an animal which has died a natural death or has not been slaughtered ritually is just as *treyf* as one of the wrong kind. The defects that can make an animal *treyf* even after it has been killed in the approved manner are academic knowledge to the boy but vivid experience for the girl who hears her mother bargain for the chicken, goes with her to have it killed by the *shokhet* and witnesses the final "koshering" at home with alternate soaking, salting and rinsing until all free blood has been drained off for *blood that has left the living stream is abhorrent as well as forbidden.* A humanitarian explanation is also given for the rule against mixing dairy foods with meat and poultry. The basis is said to be the Mosaic command that "Thou shalt not seethe the kid in the milk of its mother." For the girl, however, the problem is so compelling that the rationale may sink into the background. It becomes a matter of constant vigilance to keep the separation of milk foods and meat foods absolute in time as well as in space. They must not touch each other; they must not even be stored in the same place; they must not be cooked at the same time and they must not be eaten with the same meal. They must not be eaten from the same dishes nor with the same tableware nor must the two categories of dishes or pots be allowed to touch each other. In a house where the main room is used for many purposes besides cooking, the separation in space demands ingenuity, energy and unremitting concentration. The boy also must remember to keep dairy and meat separate in time, Six hours must elapse after meat before milk, but less time is necessary

following milk with meat. Even the poorest household must manage two separate sets of dishes, cutlery and cooking utensils—one for meat and the other for milk. There must be two additional sets for use during the eight days of Passover. The minimum need of the humblest housekeeper is *four complete and separate sets of cooking and eating utensils.* The wife of a rich man will have six sets of everything, including one pair for special Sabbath and holiday use. The problem of keeping *kosher* is many-faceted.

The economic stress in itself is considerable. Not only is *kosher* meat more costly than the other but after one has paid for a chicken with painfully earned coins, it may turn out to have a spotted liver or be otherwise unfit. One runs to the rabbi asking advice and, if possible, he will find it *kosher.* But it is not always possible and then there is no Sabbath—the joy is gone. A housewife buys very few eggs during the year and if she does invest in one, there is a special reason. But when she opens it, *she may find a fleck of blood and then there is no help. Nothing can make that egg ritually fit to eat.** After provisions have been brought home, they still must be protected. If the baby is just beginning to run about and get into things, he may ruin the food for a whole day by splashing milk into the meat pot. And again one drops everything and runs to the rabbi wailing, "What shall I do ? Must I throw it all away ?" Whenever possible, the answer is no. *Waste is wicked and to be avoided.* There are innumerable methods of "re-koshering" food that has been contaminated by contact ; rules for the amount of flesh-food necessary to dilute the ill-effects of a few drops of milk. But the methods are time-consuming and difficult and the strain is unending. The concept of *kosher* has broad application. Cloth can be *kosher* or not depending on whether it mixes linen or silk with wool. A woman on emerging from the *mikva* or ritual bath (after marital intercourse) is *kosher* and if she

*This is as true for Muslims also.

has not been purified, she is *treyf*. The menstruating bride is not *kosher* and intercourse with her is forbidden.* The terms are also used figuratively. A "*kosher*" person is one who is honest and dishonesty is described as *treyf* or non-kosher. "A thick-souled *treyf*-bone" is one way of referring to a mean, untrustworthy person. A *treyfeh* livelihood is a dishonest calling and a frequent prayer is for a "beautiful and *koshereh*" livelihood. Illegal, obscene and forbidden literature is *treyf*.**

The Muslim explanation for the similarities and differences between Jewish laws and Islamic laws rest on three basic principles. In the Holy Quran, the Mosaic laws concerning the prohibition of swine-flesh, carnivores, carrion and blood and the necessity to slaughter animals for food by severing the jugular vein swiftly with a sharp knife so that all blood runs out with the benediction of God over the animal, have been revealed again for Muslims as mandatory for all times and all places. Muslims who find themselves isolated from their fellow-believers in New York and other Western cities with large concentrations of Jews will buy their meat only from *Kosher* butchershops and take refuge in *Kosher* restaurants, assured of *Hallal* meals. But Jews will not eat animals slaughtered by Muslims because their laws are so much stricter than ours. This explains an important source of the deviation of Jewish from Islamic laws. The prohibition of mixing meat with milk is an excellent illustration of that part of the ancient Mosaic law abrogated by our Holy Quran. In ancient Egypt, boiling a kid in its

*Islamic Law is the same.

***Life is with the People : The Culture of the Shtetl*, Mark Zborowski and Elizabeth Herzog, Schoken Books, New York, 1967, pp. 367-370. (abridged).

mother's milk was not only abhorrent to the Prophet Moses (peace be upon him) from the humanitarian standpoint but much more : God forbade this practice to the *Bani Israil* because it symbolized idolatry and the pagan rites of their heathen neighbours. Since by the time of our Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him), this cruel pagan practice had long fallen into oblivion, God deemed the prohibition of mixing meat with milk no longer essential for the protection of monotheism. There is another equally significant reason why such Mosaic laws were abrogated by our Holy Quran. Judaism is essentially a tribal and parochial faith while since Islam is universal, it must be realistic and practical for all peoples at every stage of civilization. Because many of the ancient Mosaic laws are not only obsolete but much too intricate and difficult to be observed by a world-wide faith, therefore God has allowed us to eat the flesh of the camel and drink its milk and permitted us to hunt animals and birds for food, though prohibited hunting merely for sport. The Holy Quran also tells us that much of the heavy "yoke of the law" of the Jews was God's punishment for their disobedience and ingratitude. Such laws as the prohibition of shell-fish, sea-mammals and lizards have been silenced by Islamic revelation although many of our *ulema* still feel that these foods are abominable.* But for pious Jews, each and every detailed prescription of Mosaic law, no matter how antiquated it now appears or how difficult to observe, still stands intact.

*The *Deobandi* school of *ulema* also consider these animals unlawful for food according to the *Shariah*.

The most potent reason, however, for the differences between Jewish and Muslim laws is the distortion and interpolation of the scriptures of the former so that what they knew, had God originally declared to the prophets as unlawful, they permitted for themselves. Thus do we find the rabbis in the *Talmud* debating and wrangling with one another whether the use of wine is good or evil. That they were well aware of its evil effects, both on the individual and society, is evident in such passages of the Talmud where the rabbis are quoted to have declared : "When wine enters, sense goes out; when wine enters, the secret comes out! There is nothing which brings lamentation upon man so much as wine. Wine leads both men and women to unchastity." Confesses another Talmudic rabbi : "Do not become intoxicated and you will not sin."*

However, the consensus of opinion in the Talmud is that while drunkenness is bad, drinking is good! Even the most learned rabbis fail altogether to connect the two.

"Before a man drinks wine," declares another rabbi in the Talmud, "he is simple like a sheep and quiet like a lamb in front of its shearers. When he has drunk in moderation, he is strong like a lion and declares that there is none to equal him in the world. When he has drunk more than enough, he becomes like a pig wallowing in filth. When he becomes intoxicated, he becomes like a monkey dancing about, uttering obscenities before all and ignorant of what

**Everyman's Talmud,* Dr, A. Cohen, E. P. Dutton. New York, 1949, pp. 232-233.

he is doing." Still another rabbi says : "One cup of wine is good for a woman, two are degrading, three make her act like an immoral woman and four cause her to lose all self-respect and sense of shame"*

As the spirit of Judaism opposes ascetic practices, wine is regarded by Jews as one of the good things of life to such an extent that one rabbi in the Talmud declares, "There is no gladness without wine. Why is it said for what he has sinned against his soul? Because he withheld himself from wine !" Therefore Judaism regards it as a sin for a person to abstain from the "legitimate" and "innocent" pleasures and enjoyments of this world. While Islamic teachings condemn any degree of indulgence in wine along with all liquors and other intoxicants as an unmitigated curse upon the individual and society deserving of the most severe punishments in this life and in the Hereafter, Judaism looks upon wine as a positive good, so much so that **the consumption of wines and liquors is an integral part of all Jewish religious and social functions**. Before a pious Jew takes a glass of wine, he recites the following benediction: "Blessed art Thou, oh Lord our God, Who has given us to drink of the fruit of the vine." The encouragement of wine-drinking by the Jewish religion nullifies all the virtues of their other dietary laws.

Jewish religious observances revolve largely around the *Sabbath*. Every Saturday must be devoted entirely to worship, rest and good food and any manual work, even the lighting of a stove

*Ibid.*

or the switching on of a light, absolutely prohibited ! The Mosaic Law in the Old Testament decreed death as the penalty for anyone who dared transgress the prohibition against work on the Sabbath because God allegedly created the world in six days and rested on the seventh day ! The need for God to rest implies that His limited energy has been exhausted ! In Muslim eyes, this is nothing short of sheer blasphemy for an omnipotent God could never feel fatigue; a God Who could grow weary and worn out from His strenuous labours of creation, in Muslim eyes is no God at all! Furthermore, it utterly alien to the spirit of Islam to set aside one day of the week exclusively devoted to worship. The five daily prayers are obligatory upon all grown, sane men and women and our Holy Quran and Traditions ordain us to worship God round the clock, particularly during the night. Instead of one enforced weekly day of rest, Islam advises its followers to rest whenever they feel tired. Our Friday is no Sabbath as Jews and Christians understand it. It is merely a time for special congregational prayers at noontime which are short in duration. The remainder of the day, business and normal activities continue as usual. The pious Jew, however, does not apply any critical reasoning as to why his Sabbath should be observed. He accepts it unquestioningly as ordained by God in The Ten Commandments supposedly revealed to Moses (peace be upon him) in the *Pentateuch.* His strongest emotious are inseparably intertwined in all the intricate and complicated Sabbath ritual and ceremony which, however, burdensome may appear to

the non-Jew, give him intense joy and emotional gratification.

Although regular services are held daily in the Orthodox synagogue, that of the Sabbath and holidays far outstrip them in importance. The equality of all believers, so rigorously enforced in the mosque where king and beggar pray side by side, is not to be found in the synagogue. In the traditional *Ghetto* community found in eastern Europe until World War II, the choicest seats in the synagogue were along the eastern wall near the holy Ark. Here were seated all the most respected, learned and wealthy men of the community. At the rear of the synagogue near the western well, were crowded the poor, illiterate and despised. Not only that, but the favoured seats in the front near the eastern wall were often bought and paid for with considerable sums of money, and whenever one was left vacant through death, it was auctioned off to the highest bidder ! In one of his stories, Scholem Aleichem, a talented Yiddish novelist, relates the tale of twin brothers whose poverty-stricken but learned father had left them as sole inheritance his coveted seat in the synagogue close to the Ark. Twin brothers but only one seat and even their mother could not remember which had been born first ! A terrible quarrel resulted between the two brothers until their long-suffering mother intervened and begged them to take the dispute to the rabbi. The rabbi told the young men to forfeit the seat entirely and give it to another man more worthy than they for the sake of family and community peace. He assured them that since all the congregation was created by

the same God, they should not feel ashamed. The twin brothers obediently submitted to the rabbi's decision, convinced that by voluntarily forfeiting the seat, God would reward them for their charitable deed! In America, the Jew must pay an annual membership fee to have the right to attend regularly the synagogue of his choice. On the High Holidays, every seat in the synagogue is reserved for a high sum! Nothing could be more abhorrent to the Muslim. Such practices, even in this decadent age, are inconceivable in the mosque.

In order to obey the detailed prescriptions of Divine Law, extensive knowledge is essential. Thus the traditional *Ghetto* community regarded the education of boys as more important than all else. To give the Jews credit where deserved, it must be admitted that they achieved their goal of universal literacy among the men, and to a limited extent even among their women, much more effectively than we Muslims have ever been able to do. This could partially be explained by the fact that the Jews formed compact, urban communities relatively small in numbers; therefore the task was easier. But much more significant was the tremendous social prestige attached to religious learning which made parents regard no sacrifice too great to enable their sons to attain the education necessary to become a Talmudic scholar.

> The teaching methods of the *Kheyder* demand tremendous intellectual effort from a child who is almost a baby. The candies thrown on his first lesson sweeten only the first hour of learning. From then on, there is no attempt to sugar-coat the subject-matter. No text-books with pictures, no story-telling or educational games are used. The only guides to lead him into "the gates of Torah"

are dingy, tattered prayer-books with incomprehensible letters and words and old Bibles used over and over again. The process of learning is the endless repetition of unfamiliar Hebrew words, memorizing each letter, each syllable, the rote meaning of each word translated separately without reference to grammar or derivation. Real understanding of the text is left for later. Swaying as one reads and chanting the words in a fixed melody (*nign*), are considered necessary for successful study. Like praying, reading a sacred text is accompanied always by incessant rocking forward and back, forward and back and the words are read aloud in a low-voiced chant that rises and falls. "It's easier to remember what you study when you rock."* The crowded room in the *melamed's* house, where the children study from morning until nightfall, is filled always with a buzzing and humming above which rises the shrill voice of a child who is reciting or the sudden boom of the *melamed* as he pounces on some transgressor. The sound of study "as noisy as a market" can be heard in the street outside as one approaches the house. The swaying and the chanting become automatic. Later, the students will also acquire the appropriate gestures with the index finger and the thumb, sweeping the thumb through an upward arc of inquiry and nailing down the point of the answer with the trust of the index finger. Study is not passive but active, involving constant motor and vocal activity. Above all, the students are trained to be attentive to the words of the *melamed* and ready to repeat the reading or the translation of the word the moment he indicates it with his fateful pointer. Inattention or absent-mindedness is severely punished and very often sleeping interest is wakened by the lash. The *melamed* has great opportunity to descend on the inattentive since the pupils are at different points in their studies and each proceeds at his own pace. While one individual or group is reciting, the others are

*In Muslim countries, the Quran is chanted in the same manner.

supposed to give their full attention to their assignments but the dignity of being "*kheyder* boys" does not prevent them from being little children. There are secret signals and messages, bursts of playing if the *melamed* leaves the room for a moment, usually paid for in full when he returns. Yet, little by little, the child does learn to read and to translate. In this small, ill-lit, ill-ventilated room, he lays the foundation for the next steps that may lead him at last into "the world of Torah."

In this first and most elementary *kheyder*, the pupils learn the elements of reading and the prayers (pp. 92-93). After this the boy is now launched in the second *kheyder* and entitled to be known as a "*Khumesh* boy" The *Khumesh* boy does not begin his study of the Pentateuch with first book, *Genesis*, and its delightful stories, but with *Leviticus*, the dull and difficult theory of animal scarifices. The most popular commentator of the Torah and the Talmud and the one most studied in *khumesh kheyder* is Rashi who lived in the eleventh century A.D. From his study in the *khumesh kheyder*, the child becomes acquainted not only with direct explanation of direct statements but also with involved interpretation and the search for hidden meanings. *Khumesh* and Rashi represent merely the elementary phases of study in which puplis are taught directly by the *melamed* as befits small children and beginners. In the highest *kheyder*, the *gemoreh kheyder*, that sort of instruction is gradually replaced by the principle of independent study under the guidance of the teacher. This *melamed* is of a different order from the scorned teacher of the elementary *kheyder*. The intellectual caliber and the status of the teacher rise with the level of the school. The *gemorah kheyder* is devoted chiefly to the study of the Talmud, which covers an infinite variety of aspects and problems, ancient and contemporary, religious and secular. Talmudic studies consist of continuous discussion, commentary and interpretation with the help of innumerable commentators and interpreters. With equal concentration, the child of eight

or nine must study the holiday ritual in the Temple of Solomon, the ethics of man-to-man dealings, the laws of divorce or the rules governing connubial behaviour during menstruation.

It is with the Talmudic studies that the true joy of learning is born. In the elementary *kheyder*, the work was routine, mechanical, boring, repetitious, depending on memory rather than on understanding. Talmudic studies open the way to the exercise of individual capacities and imagination. The *gemorah kheyder* where the boy of ten or eleven begins to study the main code of Jewish wisdom, is a crucial phase of his education. Here he begins to display the real quality of his memory and his power to spend long hours over a difficult problem, using countless commentaries and interpretations with aptness and insight. Here he shows whether he has the caliber of the true Talmudic scholar. His teacher's opinion is not enough. The father may take him from time to time on a Sabbath to be examined by some member of the family who is especially erudite or to any famous scholar in the community and the verdict will be awaited anxiously. The whole family listens to the conversation, especially the mother because the opinion of a learned man means a great deal for the future of her son. The great question is: does he have the talent for a life of study or should he interrupt his education and go into trade or business? If the boy is judged capable of becoming a Talmudic scholar, he is sent from the *gemorah kheyder* to the highest institution of learning in the Ghetto, the *Yeshiva*. There, among hundreds of boys from different towns and provinces under the guidance of eminent scholars, he will devote all his days and a great part of his nights to study. A *yeshiva* boy customarily sleeps no more than four or five hours a night, rising at daybreak or earlier and sitting over his books until long past midnight. The general principle of the *Yeshiva* is independence and self-reliance. The program of study allows for infinite variation. The basic study is an exhaustive analysis of the Talmud

and its commentators. In addition, each student is privileged to spend a large part of his time on that part of Jewish wisdom which appeals to him most. If he is attracted by mystical problems, he will study the *Kabala*; if philosophy is his field, he will delve into the works of the philosophers like Maimonides; if he is interested in legal qustions, he will concentrate on the Talumd and its commentators. In all cases, the approach is the same; commentary, interpretation, referring of the different texts to the appropriate biblical quotation that is their ultimate source. Talmudic study is often called *pilpul*, meaning "pepper" and it is as sharp, spicy and stimulating as its name implies. Penetration, scholarship, imagination, memory, logic, wit and subtlety all are called into play for solving a Talmudic question. The ideal solution is the *khiddush*, an original synthesis that has never been offered before. This mental activity is a delight both to the performer and his audience. When two accomplished scholars engage in *pilpul*, they will be surrounded by an admiring group that follows each sally in eager silence and later will discuss the fine points with each other, possibly working up a new argument about which the scholar carried the day.

In order to be able to devote his life to study, the *Yeshiva* student has to be assured of material subsistence Very few of the students have parents who can support them. The solution of this problem demonstrates once more the importance attached to the study of the sacred Law. *The community takes over the burden of supporting, not only the Yeshvia itself, but each individual student.*

Whether a man is a great savant or one who spells out his words syllable by syllable, in the ghetto, the amount of knowledge amassed by his study *is not officially labelled. There is no degree marking the completion of a certain phase of study,* for completion does not exist—"the Torah has no end." The study of the Holy Books may be interrupted or may diminish in intensity but *it never stops.* No matter how long a man lives, he can continue to explore new wonders in the

limitless intricacies and vistas of the Law. During middle age, unless he is one of the scholarly elite, he must spend at least a part of his time making a living. But after retirement, the very devout man will once more devote to study all his waking hours except those that are spent in prayer. And the waking hours will be many. He will rise before daybreak and study before his morning prayers, hurry to the synagogue, returning for breakfast before plunging again into study. His day of study will be broken by two more trips to the synagogue for prayers, by meals and by occasional learned discussions. Only after midnight will he stop for sleep in order to be up again in the early morning for the daily round of study and prayer. Of such a man it is said that "he is always over the Torah and over his prayer services." (pp. 98-102).

The 613 commandments or *mitsvos* enumerate specific duties which relate to three major obligations. One is the obligation to constantly study the word of God in order to gain ever greater knowledge of the commandments and to approach the Truth that lies in the Holy Books. Equally important is the obligation to establish a family in order to preserve and increase the number of those dedicated to the service of the true God. The third major obligation is observance of the myriad of social, economic and ritual activities directed toward the fulfilment of the commandments that regulate the relationship between man and God, between man and his fellow man and himself, (pp. 105-106). This sacred literature provided the texts that the boy begins to study in the *kheyder* and continues to study until the end of his days. It is more than a code of law ; for it is also a code of ethics and a handbook of daily behaviour. Every detail—social, religious, economic, moral—is examined and discussed and a definite rule is set for it, with exceptions and implications fully defined. It may be a primary prohibition forbidding him to eat pork, or a "fence" prohibition forbidding him to talk to women

in order to avoid all possibility of adultery. It may be a primary command not to commit murder or a "fence" command not to study without wearing a girdle which will separate the upper or sacred part of the body from the lower or profane part. It may be an injunction to succour the orphan or against thinking about a business deal on the Sabbath. No subject is too large and none too small to be included in the all-embracing attention of the scholars. All of Jewish culture is the subject of Jewish learning. Each detail of life supplies an opportunity to fulfil God's command and at the same time is loaded with the danger of violating some rule set down in the pact. The covenant which God concluded with Israel is a mutual welfare pact and is so interpreted. Its purpose is not only to insure to the Almighty recongnition and obedience but also to insure to mortal man enjoyment in this world and eternal happiness in the world to come. In return, people who devote themselves to fulfillment of the *mitsvos* count on three specific privileges based on the Covenant. It gives them the right to ask for health and livelihood with the hope that if the commandments are fulfilled, this request will be granted. Health and comfortable living, taken together, are called *Ulam Hazen*—this world. Moreover, they count on *Ulam Habu*—the world to come. Finally, they look forward to the coming of the Messiah and the return of the Jews to Palestine—the Promised Land. The coming of the Messiah will end the sufferings of the Diaspora, (the exile), inflicted as Divine punishment for past violations of the pact (p. 106).

There is a blanket dispensation that with three exceptions, one may do anything at all to preserve his life if there is mortal danger. The three things that are forbidden even on pain of death are conversion, bloodshed and immorality. On these three points the ethics of the *shtetl* are rigid. Aside from them, the Torah is viewed as a code that is absolutely binding yet at the same time subject to interpretation and adjustment. As the course of history introduces changes in

social, economic and geographical conditions, the Law must be adapted to meet them so that man will not be put in the impossible position of having to choose between the Law and life itself.* (pp. 112-113)

Moreover, problems that arise from the conditions of Jewish life in one country are debated by scholars in another. Historians have discovered a great deal about the economic and social life of Jews in medieval Europe from the *Responsa* of the masters who conducted *Yeshivas* in Persia. A rabbi in Germany will consult his colleague from Poland on a difficult question sent in by a student in France.

The unperturbed disregard of Western concepts of time and space limitations assumes that the unity of the tradition is stronger than any break in the physical or temporal continuity. This assumption helps to explain why the Talmudic scholar regards his discipline as practical and realistic while to the outsider it appears abstract and theoretical. Every discussion is geared to a concrete situation, one that may be imaginary but is never impossible. To the true Talmudic scholar, it must be remembered that such a problem as correct carving of the sacrificial lamb is no abstraction but a concrete situation that has occurred and may occur again when the Temple is rebuilt. Such a scholar classes his studies as applied science to the science of applying divine commandments to daily life. He has scant regard for pure science, pure literature or pure poetry. He can see in such studies no direct goal or purpose. There is no pure philosophy, pure esthetics or pure mathematics in the learning tradition of the *shtetl.* Mathematics is studied in connection with biblical problems in agriculture or architecture; esthetics in connection with the decoration of the Temple; philosophy in conjunction with ethics or with understanding the nature of God. Similarly a piece of fiction must have a moral. It must be written in order to teach. Poetry

*This is almost identical to the Islamic concept of *Ijtihad.*

is not just an esthetic arrangement of words and sentences but a beautifully phrased expression of praise for the Lord or some moral idea....The sacred writings stem directly from Mount Sinai, from God and *nothing can be learned which was not stated or implied long ago in the basic works or the commentaries of the sages.* "It is a shame that so many modernist Jews study other subjects to find the answers to life's questions when everything is in the Torah. The Holy Books cover every detail of life." Since no aspect of life divorced from the Law embodied in the Holy Books, the *shtetl* draws no line between the religious and the secular. Strictly speaking, there are no secular elements, since all life is one fused whole and all truth is embodied in the sacred writings.* For the *shtetl*, the opposition is not so much between secular and non-secular as between Jewish and non-Jewish.

Rigid distinctions of time are blurred and blended in the tradition of Jewish learning. The discussion between two Talmudists of the second century about which parts of a sacrificed lamb should go to the High Priest in the Temple, have not lost their actuality even though the Temple, the sacrifices and the priests no longer exist. A clever student from the *shtetl* will throw new light upon the problem, drawing from the brilliant interpretation of a medieval scholar. The zealous yeshiva boy participates in the discussions between Rabbi Hillel and Rabbi Shammai who both lived in the first century A.D., analyses the arguments of a seventeenth century rabbi which support one against the other and arrives at his own original conclusions....Not only the past and the present but also the future are interwoven in the learning tradition. In the days to come when Messiah brings together all the Jews and rebuilds the Temple, the learned ones will study Torah together and the Lord will discuss the problems that could not be mastered and were left pending until the coming of the Messiah. This con-

*Devout Muslims share these same convictions about the ›mprehensiveness of Quran and Hadith.

> tinuity from Moses to Messiah links together Rabbi Akiba, the scholar tortured to death by Roman legionnaires, Don Isaac Abarbanel, who led the exiled Jews from Spain the year the New World was discovered, and the famished Yeshiva boy studying and starving under Nazi rule in Poland. There are no dates in Jewish learning.... A page of the Talmud looks the same now as two hundred years ago and the same in Vilna as in Shanghai. All over the world, students are poring over the same Torah, the same Talmud, the same commentary of Rashi. Through study, the Jew finds the joy of identification with his God, his tradition and his group, for Torah, God and Israel are one. (pp. 116-118)*

**In this intense reverence for the sacred law as a complete way of life and the scriptures and their interpretations as the supreme authority for Truth, Judaism and Islam meet on common ground.** This accounts for the striking similarity between the kind of education imparted to the Jewish youth in the traditional *ghetto* communities in Eastern Europe and young Muslims when our civilization was at its height. The Jewish boy in the *kheydar* would not feel strange in a typical old-fashioned *maktab* in the mosque. The youth studying at the New York rabbinical academy would not feel out of place at the Jamiyah Ashrafiya Madrassah here in Lahore. The kind of religious training imparted at al-Azhar University in Cairo a century ago would seem quite familiar to the yeshiva student in the *ghetto* of Vilna and *vice versa.* Among a group of Orthodox rabbis discussing the sacred law, our *ulema* could make themselves quite at home and all would enjoy themselves immensely. The late Dr. Ahmad Amin, a

**Life is with the People : The Culture of the Shtetl,* op. cit.

notable literary figure in Egypt, relates in his autobiography that his father was a learned *Shaikh*, a lover of Arabic calligraphy and that his whole life revolved exclusively around mosque and school. The father of Shaikh Hassan al Banna, the founder of the banned *Ikhwan al Muslimun*, was no less immersed in a life of learning and piety. He was an expert at the watchmaking trade and worked at night. During the day, he served as *Imam* at the local mosque where he preached and taught. His leisure time was spent in his library. Islamic jurisprudence was his special joy and he was the author of a commentary on the *Musnad* of Ahmad Ibn Hanbal. Such men would find a congenial cultural atmosphere in the *Shtetl*.

A question which remains for consideration is the place of girls in the educational system of the Talmud. On this matter we find diametrically opposite views taken. One teacher declared: 'A man is obliged to treach his daughter Torah' but this statement is immediately followed by the opposing view. 'Whoever teaches his daughter Torah is as though he taught her obscenity.' The latter opinion, it must be admitted, was the one more generally held and practiced. For instance, notice was taken of the fact that in the exhortation: 'Ye shall teach your children' (Deut. XI : 19) the Hebrew word more literally denotes 'your sons' and so excludes the daughters. One rabbi asserted: 'Let the words of the Torah rather be destroyed by fire than imparted to women,' and we are informed that when a woman put a question to a rabbi in connection with the Golden Calf, he rebuked her saying that a woman has no learning except in the use of the spindle. In the circumstances of that age, the woman's only sphere was the home and the fear was that her care of the household woul suffer if she spent

> her time and energy in study. But other reasons may be suggested for the reluctance to permit women to pursue advanced learning. The religious leaders of Israel knew what happened in Greece and Rome where the education of women brought them into close intercourse with men and resulted in laxity of morals. Furthermore, the rabbis were doubtless aware of what was happening in Christendom where women, carried away by religious fervour, gave themselves up to a life of celibacy. Such a procedure could only have been contemplated with horror in the Jewish community where marriage was looked upon as the divinely ordained state. The Talmud denounces certain persons as being 'destroyers of the world', among them being 'the female Pharisee'—the woman of excessive piety. It seems very probable that to counteract such tendencies as these, the rabbis adopted so antagonistic an attitude to women delving deeply into the lore of the Torah.*

This quotation illustrates a profound difference between the status of the woman in Judaism and Islam. By Talmudic precept, Jewish women are barred in theory as well as in practice from acquiring advanced learning in Torah. **Religious scholarship in Judaism is reserved exclusively for men.** Although in practice, the majority of Jewish women in the traditional *ghetto* of Eastern Europe could read and write Yiddish and recite the Hebrew prayers without understanding them, their academic studies rarely progressed beyond the most elementary level. Although some of the wives, daughters and sisters of renowned scholars did acquire, simply through informal contact, considerable knowledge of Talmudic lore, **even these exceptionally learned women had no status in**

***Everyman's Talmud*, op. cit., pp. 179-180.

**the community, and were regarded as queer and abnormal because intellectual activity was only for men.** It is significant that the few Jewish women who not only acquired learning but esteem for their scholarship* all lived under Muslim rule.

In contrast to Judaism, there is nothing in Islam to condemn the education of women; on the contrary, the Traditions of our Holy Prophet regard the striving after religious knowledge as obligatory for women as for men and all the authentic Hadith praise the father who educates his daughter and exhorts the master to educate his slave-girl and then free her and marry her as among the most virtuous deeds in the sight of Allah. It is a historical fact that many pious women had memorized the Holy Quran; that women, particularly Hazrat Ayesha, took a very active role in the preservation and transmission of the *Hadith.*** Even in later times, the Islamic countries were by no means devoid of learned women as proved by Ibn Khallikan's famed biographical dictionary. As late as the 13th century, we find a woman, as a most esteemed professor of Hadith at the University of Baghdad. Two learned sisters, Maryam and Fatimah, are renowned to this day throughout Morocco as the founders of the Qarawiyyin University Mosque. To cite modern examples, the first teacher of the founder of the Sanussi movement was none else than his aunt who was respected by all who knew her a woman of high intelligence and intellectual attainments. The mother of Maulana

*See *Jews and Arabs*, Goitein, op. cit., pp. 185-187.

** "Lady Transmitters of Hadith", *The Muslim World*, Karachi, Seprember 10, 17, 1977, pp. 6.

Abul Kalam Azad (1888-1958), a native of Mecca, was also an Arabic scholar. The women of my husband's Pathan family are all literate in Urdu, including even the oldest women who throughout their lives have observed the strictest *Purdah* and were, in their childhood and youth, privately tutored by their parents at home. Then to cite my own case as a final example, although I have at times been rebuked for my shortcomings as housewife and mother, my literary endeavours for the Islamic cause have always won me praise and esteem. Those who differ with me, criticize my writings either because they disagree with my opinions or because they find some defect in the logic of my arguments and mode of expression, but in either case, *my writings are always praised or criticised on their merits.* **Never have my books or essays been scorned by any Muslims merely because the author was a woman.**

Although all these examples of esteemed educated Muslim women, past and present, are facts, to the delight of the enemies of Islam, it must be admitted that they are all exceptions. The overwhelming majority of the Muslim women, not only poverty-stricken peasants and nomads but even in prosperous urban families until the impact of the modern West, lived in ignorance and illiteracy. The interplay of various historical, social and economic factors unrelated to Islam are largely responsible.

In contrast to Judaism and Christianity, there is no emphasis in the theology of Islam on woman's inferiority. Our Holy Quran tells us that men are superior to women because God has made the former

to excel the latter and because they spend their property for the support of women. But this inferiority is *not* absolute but only relative. Our Holy Quran says that women have rights over men to be treated with kindness, consideration and compassion but men are a degree above them. This does not mean that all men are physically and mentally superior to all women. Women like Hazrat Khadijah and Hazrat Ayesha were superior to most men. It only means that if the strongest and most intelligent of women could be compared to the strongest and most intelligent man, the man would be a degree above her. This does not imply that the woman should be scorned. She would still be superbly endowed.* Contrast this concept of woman in Islam with the theology of the Jews :

> The *Shtetl* sees it self through the eyes of men and talks about itself through the words of men. It is set up as a man's culture with women *officially* subordinate and *officially* inferior. The man greets each day by offering thanks to God that 'Thou has not made me a woman!' and each day the woman in her early morning prayer offers praise to God 'Who has made me according to Thy will.' This view of woman is represented by the story of Adam and Eve in the Bible. Woman is inferior to the man because she was created after him and was made from his body. Moreover according to the legends of the Talmud and the practices of the *shtetl*, **woman is by nature sinful.** because Eve

*Female literacy was especially high in Muslim Spain which was full of learned women, "The Cordoba law school became world famous; one celebrated lawyer who was versed in the *Hadith* was an intensely black Negress who had migrated to Spain from the East and married a prominent Arab in the the Spanish Capital." *Falcon of Spain*. T.B. Irving, Shaikh Muhammad Ashraf, Lahore, 1973. pp. 139.

incited Adam to eat of the forbidden fruit.*

This concept of "Original Sin", for which Eve was allegedly responsible and which became fundamental dogma in Christianity, finds no place in our Holy Quran.

Nowhere in the Old Testament is polygamy condemned as all its most revered patriarchs freely practiced it with divine sanction. However, under Christian influence, polygamy began to fall into disfavour among the Jews. In the Talmud, divergent opinions are expressed on the subject. One rabbi says that a man should be allowed as many wives as he wants; another declares that the number of wives should be restricted to four (which was confirmed by the revelation in our Holy Quran) and still another rabbi says that a husband upon taking another wife, must grant divorce to the first wife if she wants it. (The latter is the stand taken by our Pakistan Family Laws Ordinance enacted in 1961). In Christian-dominated Europe, the leading rabbis forbade the practice of polygamy completely. However, in the Arab world, no such ban existed and, consequently, polygamy was, until very recently, as prevalent there among Jews as Muslims.

In many respects the position of women in the traditional *Ghetto* community and Islamic society are strikingly similar, particularly the functional division of labour between the sexes and the ideal of woman as devoted wife and mother. Since the formation of

**Life is with the People*: *The Culture of the Shtetl*, op. cit., pp. 132-134.

the family for the raising of worthy children is a sacred duty in Judaism, the Talmud condemns birth control in the strongest terms and allows contraception only in exceptional individual cases on medical grounds. To give the Jews their deserved credit, family ties among them are generally strong, characterized by faithfulness and steadfast loyalty between husband and wife; adultery and fornication are rare and lewdness almost unknown. Filial piety occupies an important place in this culture and although Jewish law allows divorce, it is not often practiced.

Amidst the social and moral disintegration in the West, Jews have been far better able than their Christian neighbours, to withstand the collapse of the family. Although my own family was not at all religiously observant, most of the marriages among my relatives have been happy and enduring; divorce is almost unknown; none of my blood relatives, not even my cousins or nieces have ever been involved in any sexual misbehaviour or delinquent activity; nobody in my family has ever been convicted of crime and sent to prison. Not once in all the years of my childhood or youth, did I ever hear my parents exchange harsh words; dirty language was never heard in our house. Ties of mutual responsibility and love between the generations last for life.

> The ideal woman is a good wife and mother. In order to be a good Jew, whatever else she does or does not do, she must take *hallah*, light the Sabbath candles and purify herself in the ritual bath after menstruation, childbirth and marital intercourse. The good wife and mother helps her husband to fulfil his obligations. She is responsible for

the observance of the dietary laws and for maintaining or implementing all the domestic ritual. She is not included in the religious ritual outside of the house and, in fact, is not expected to be familiar with it. Moreover, she does not have powers of discretion, even in household ceremonials. On any problem of observance, she must consult a man—her husband, the rabbi, a respected scholar and even if she knows the answer by experience, she has not the right to decide for herself. The formal demands upon woman are revealed repeatedly in comments on womanly virtues. 'She was a perfect Jewish woman—clean, patient, hardworking, silent, submissive to God and to her husband and devoted to her children. Her own well-being was unimportant. I don't remember my mother sitting at the table when we ate except for Friday night and Saturdays. Those days she even sat on the whole chair. Other times when she was sitting, it was always on the edge of her chair. I believe she never ate a whole meal, always some leftovers. When I was older, I asked her why she was like that and she said, "Friday night on Sabbath eve I am a queen like every Jewish woman. On weekdays I am just a woman!"

The woman's informal status is more demanding and more rewarding than that formally assigned to her, for in actual living, the complementary character of her role is always to the fore. She is the wife who orders the functioning of the household and provides the setting in which each member performs his part. She is, above all, the *Mother*—key figure in the family constellation. She is the chief counselor, likely to have the power of veto in any matter outside the world of Torah. "What do you say?" is the husband's familiar query and a common response is: "What can a silly woman say? I have only a womanish brain but if I were in your place...." Often enough, the opinion, so modestly prefaced, is decisive.

The earning of a livelihood is sexless and the large majority of women participate in some gainful occupation even if they do not carry the chief burden of support. The

wife of a "perennial student" is very apt to be the sole support of the family. The problem of managing both a business and a home is so common that no one recognizes it as special. Of course, a woman sees that her house is clean, her children fed and all regulations observed even if she also runs a shop, has a stall at the market or merely helps her husband at his store.

**Clearly, although the woman's life is home centered, it is by no means home limited.** She does the buying and often the selling. She is familiar with the market place and with the merchants who frequent it. As full participant in the burden of economic support, the **woman escapes the burden of a sheltered life.** If anyone is sheltered, it is the scholarly man. **Women and girls move about freely.** If business takes the woman to another town, she will stay with relatives, of course, for there are always relatives. But everyone assumes that she can take care of herself and even though an extremely high stake is set on womanly virtue, there is no overweening fear that she will not be able to preserve her own. The important point is that, unlike the synagogue which is dominated by men and the home which is dominated by women, the market place belongs to both and the consequences of this three-fold division permeate every aspect of *shtetl* life. To be a spinster is a dreadful fate which fortunately occurs far more in the anxious forebodings of girls and their parents than in fact. The *shtetl* does not provide any respectable place for the single woman. Up to a point, education enhances a girl's value as a bride but that point is set by her functions as assistant to the learned man. **Too much learning is unfeminine.** Since study of divine law, the primary status criterion, is not for women, they are automatically excluded from top honors in the community. A woman's status relates not to herself as an individual but to her position as wife and mother. The world to come is pictured traditionally in masculine terms as a glorified, eternalized Yeshiva. The dutiful wife sits at her husband's feet and enjoys eternal bliss through him. All are confident that

if the woman has been a good Jew, she will be made happy in the Hereafter. More important than the precise details is the basic assurance in the Talmud that every Jew has a share in the world to come.*

In contrast, the Muslim woman leads a sheltered life. She is expected to spend her time at home and only go out when compelled by necessity. Whether married or single, the Muslim woman is not expected to earn her livelihood so long as she has a male relative to look after her. But although the Jewish woman is not so restricted in her movements as the Muslim woman and participates in some outdoor activities, **there is little social mingling of the sexes.** Here is the Jewish version of *Purdah* :

> The monthly period with the additional seven-day interim means that for two weeks each month a man may not sleep with his wife. "Half the time she belongs to him; half the time to God." During the half month when she belongs to her husband, they will scrupulously observe the regulations he learned so thoroughly as a student. A blessing must be said before the two lie together. They must be in the dark and nobody must witness their pleasure. There is a rule also that the body must be at least partly covered. The man wears his *yarmelkeh* or skull cap even in bed and also the fringed *talis koton* that marks him as a Jew. Any sexual indulgence except for procreation is sinful.** The popular stereotype of the groom is an innocent who is at a loss despite his academic acquaintance with all the rules in the sacred writings for connubial behaviour

* *Ibid.*, pp. 129-132.

** "Jewish married couples follow an old rule of alternating abstinence and enjoyment. During the twelve days after the menses begin—or seven days after they cease, wife and husband sleep apart, *The main practical result of this is that they rejoin just at the time when when the wife is most likely to conceive—the opposite of the rhythm system of birth control.*" **This is my God**, Herman Wouk, Doubleday, New York, 1960, p. 126.

but he may need days or weeks in order to suit the act to the written word. The bride is expected to lack even verbal knowledge about this aspect marriage. Sex as a topic of discussion, even between husband and wife, is taboo. (pp. 286, 287). Because it is sinful to be distracted by thoughts of sex while studying the Law, boys are married early so that their needs will be satisfied and they will have no difficulty concentrating on their books. The more talented the student, the more effort is made to have him marry young, even at fourteen or fifteen. Purity in other words is sought through immunizing rather than through quarantine. "There is no such thing as a Jewish monastery," says the proverb. The precautions taken are not against sex but against the intrusion of sex at the wrong time and in the wrong context. The precautions themselves are severe. *The bride's hair is cut off and for the rest of her life she wears a wig in order to reduce her dangerous charms. A woman is not supposed to wear short sleeves, short skirts or low-cut necklines** and in any case, a man should not study in a room where a woman's arms or legs are exposed. *He should not listen to a woman singing lest she arouse his desire.* The woman is considered so potent a source of attraction that *a man must avert his eyes in order to protect them** both. Some men will not even speak directly to a woman. Most would avoid passing between two of them.* The burden of avoidance is more on the man than on the woman. She is expected to comply with sartorical regulations and refrain from obtruding herself but the responsibility for not looking at her, talking to her or touching her, is his. A division of sexes at social functions follows naturally from the division of interests and responsibilities as well as from the avoidance rule and the concept of feminine inferiority. At weddings the men and women stand in separate groups during the ceremony and sit at different tables for the feast. In the olden days *it was*

*These dress restrictions apply to Muslim women as well.

**This commandment is ordained in the Quran also.

*unthinkable for men and girls to dance together but in later years this prohibition broke down among the "liberals" and the "advanced." Separation of the sexes is obligatory and men precede women* although the duty of strict observance lies more heavily on the educated and prosperous than on the ignorant and poor*.

Thus though certain specific regulations concerning the segregation of the sexes may differ between Judaism and Islam, **the purpose is the same.** With the destruction of the traditional *Ghetto* community in Russia by the Communist revolution and Eastern Europe by Nazi occupation, these regulations swiftly fell into oblivion. Consequently, the contemporary Jewish woman, whether she lives in America, Russia or "Israel", has whole-heartedly adopted modern customs until now scarcely anything distinguishes her from other Western women.

Jewish practices in conformity to Islamic ways include circumcision, which is performed on all new-born male babies, the wearing of beards, the covering of the head and the banning of pictures and statues, at least in the synagogue. Even today, ultra-orthodox Jews object to having their photographs taken unless compelled by necessity. Jews greet other Jews with "*Scholem Aleichem*" (peace be with you) just as Muslim greet each other with "*Assalaam Alaikum*" which means the same thing. The affinity between Jewish and Islamic culture is illustrated by the following quotation :

Many of the butchers who supply the Muslim inhabitants of the metropolis of Cairo with meat are Jews. A few years ago one of the principal *ulema* here complained of this

**Ibid.*, pp. 135-137.

> fact to the Pasha and begged him to put a stop to it. Another of the *ulema*, hearing that this person had gone to make the complaint above mentioned, followed him and urged before the Pasha that the practice was not unlawful. "Adduce your proof," said the former. "Here," answered the other, "is my proof from the word of God, 'Eat of that whereon the name of God hath been commemorated'." (Quran VI : 118). The chief of the Jewish butchers was then summoned and asked whether he said anything previous to slaughtering an animal. He answered, "Yes, we always say as the Muslims, 'In the name of God. God is most great,' and we never kill an animal in any other way than by cutting its throat." The complaint was consequently dismissed.*

Also in conformity to the spirit of Islam, the pious Jew recites a prayer for every occasion. Besides the three ritual daily prayers, a devout Jew praises God as soon as he awakes in the morning, before and after meals, on seeing the wonders of nature, during an electrical storm, eclipse of the sun or moon, an earthquake, on seeking a rainbow, on hearing good and bad tidings, for departing on a journey, for undertaking a business venture, for sickness and for death. These prayers for every occasion are intended to have the believer engaged in constant remembrance of God in everything he does and make God a living reality in his daily life. The Jews even have a prayer for the Government which runs as follows :

> He Who granted victory to kings and dominion to princes, His kingdom is a kingdom of all ages; He who delivered His servant David from the evil sword; He who opened a road through the sea, a path amid the mighty

**The Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians,* Edward William Lane, E. P. Dutton, New York, 1954, pp. 299-300.

> waters, may He bless and protect, help and exalt the President and the Vice-President and all the officers of this country. May the supreme King of Kings in His mercy, sustain them and deliver them from all distress and misfortune. May the supreme King of Kings in his mercy, inspire them and all their counselors and aides *to deal kindly with us and with all Israel.* In their days and in our days Judah shall be saved; Israel shall dwell in security and a redeemer shall come to Zion. May this be the will of God and let us say Amen.*

This prayer implies the acceptance by Jews in the Diaspora of *secularism.* The modern Jew living in America, Russia or "Israel," has whole-heartedly embraced secularism in theory as well as in practice. The traditional *Ghetto* communities in medieval Europe and in Russia and Poland until World War II, however, were so self-contained that until recent times, they comprised almost a state within a state. For all practical purposes, the Jews in the *Ghetto* ruled themselves; they lived according to their own laws; they had their own courts and judges with the rabbi occupying the most authoritative position in the community. Except for paying taxes and sometimes being subjected to military conscription, the Jews living in the *Ghetto* took little interest in the central Government. As the Talmudic law includes juridical, civil and penal matters as well as dealing with the intricacies of ritual, the Jews until modern times regarded their faith as a complete way of life. However, the sacred laws of the Jews are totally silent about one extremely important aspect of life—international relations.

***Ha-Siddur Ha-Shalem,* op. cit., p. 380.

Because those rabbis who compiled the Talmud could not envision the Jews except as a small minority in a non-Jewish state, always on the defensive, they did not make provision for such crucial issues as relations between Jews and non-Jews, the conduct of State, intercourse with other nations or any laws regulating warfare. Consequently, when the Jews finally did achieve a State of their own, since Divine guidance was lacking in these aspects, even the most devout Jews did not feel accountable towards God for their dealings with the Arabs and based their behaviour purely on opportunism and expediency.

With the rise of secularism which proclaimed the equality of all citizens regardless of creed (at least on paper), the Jews repudiated their former aloofness from the gentile majority and began to participate enthusiastically in Western culture. In defending the position of the modern Jew on the subject, a "progressive" rabbi writes:

> The Jews did not leave the *Torah* but the *Torah* in so far as civil and criminal laws are concerned, ceased to function in the life of modern Jews the moment they became full fledged citizens of the contemporary secular state. In Islam, not in Judasim, revelation is conceived as law. When modern Orthodox rabbis say that not a single law can be abrogated, they are more like the *ulema* of Islam than the teachers of Judaism, the rabbis. Although Islam taught a rational civilization to barbaric masses, it did this for a price. Nobody is allowed freedom. Islam is religious totalitarianism. And true Judaism cannot flourish without freedom!*

**The Jewish Mission*, Rabbi Ignaz Maybaum, James Clarke & Co., London, p. 94; quoted in *A Modern Approach to Islam*, Asaf A. Fyzee, Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1963, p. 106.

It is highly significant that this kind of Jewish modernism is so enthusiastically quoted by a Muslim modernist to back his own sophistries. The consensus view of the modern orthodox Jew towards Zionism is illustrated in the following prayer by the Chief Rabbinate of "Israel".

> Our Father Who art in heaven, Protector and Redeemer of Israel, bless Thou the state of Israel which marks the dawn of our deliverance. Shield it beneath the wings of Thy love; spread over it Thy canopy of peace; send thy light and Thy truth to its leaders, officers, and counselors and direct them with Thy good counsel. Oh God, strengthen the defenders our Holy Land; grant them salvation and crown them with victory. Establish peace in the land and everlasting joy for its inhabitants. Remember our brethren, the whole house of Israel, in all the lands of their dispersion. Speedily let them walk upright to Zion and Thy city, Jerusalem, Thy dwelling place as it is written in the Torah of Thy servant Moses: "Even if you are dispersed in the uttermost parts of the world, from there the Lord your God will gather and fetch you. The Lord your God will bring you into the land which your fathers possessed and you shall possess it." (Deuteronomy 30 : 4). Unite our hearts to love Thy name and to **observe all the precepts of Thy Torah.** Shine forth in Thy glorious majesty over all the inhabitants of Thy world. Let everything that breathes proclaim: "Thy Lord God of Israel is King; His majesty rules over all." Amen!*

This prayer has not been fulfilled. Despite the fact that the Jews now have their state, *its leaders are nearly all atheists imbued with socialism and secularism* and determined to govern accordingly. Some of the orthodox

**Ha-Siddur Ha-Salem*, op. cit., p. 700.

Jews in "Israel" have organized religious parties which clamour for the implementation of the *Torah* as the supreme law of the land but they are contemptuously regarded as fanatics by those in power. Yet the ultra-orthodox have not given up hope and still strive to attain a theocratic state. Thus far they have not been successful. The very essence of modern Zionism is hostile to all the religious values of traditional Jewish culture. In order to understand the precise relationship between Judaism and Zionism, it is first necessary to discuss the rise of modern secularism, nationalism and materialism among the Jews of Europe and America in recent times.

After the French Revolution at the end of the eighteenth century, one country after another in Western Europe declared its Government founded upon a completely secular basis with no distinction between its Jewish and Gentile citizens. It was at this time when the Jews in Western Europe gradually abandoned their distinctive religious culture and were determined wholeheartedly to participate in modern Western life. Most strongly affected by this wave of westernization were the Jews of Germany.

> The most noted of the handful of Jewish apostles of elightenment was Moses Mendelssohn (1729-1786)..It was Moses Mendelssohn who organized the historic movement among Jews not only to break down the walls of their physical ghettos, symbols of their economic and social strangulation but also to destroy the equally imprisoning ghetto within—the backwardness, ignorance, cultural stagnation and hopelessness that had been depressing Jewish community life for so many centuries. By means of the printed word and of the establishment of liberal religious schools in which

German was the language of instruction, the *Haskalah* or Jewish Enlightenment movement sought to draw reluctant fellow-Jews out of the ghetto and into the broad light of the modern Western world and general non-Jewish culture.

Mendelssohn had translated the *Pentateuch* into German and had published it parallel with the Hebrew text, thus making it possible for thousands of German Jews who knew Hebrew and Yiddish, to learn the German language. Oddly enough, although the Jewish enlightenment movement succeeded in secularizing many Jews and in leading them to more modern values, *it ultimately defeated its own intention to bind Jews closer to their religious heritage.* Many of its most vocal devotees were lured eventually by a hunger for social acceptance among Christians into expediently becoming Christians. *In fact, there was a morbid movement to apostasy.* It is estimated that at least half of Berlin's Jewry was baptised during the first decades of the nineteenth century. The assimilation of German culture by Jews moved faster than the wearer of the proverbial seven-league boots, especially in wealthy and cultured circles. *It is an ironic commentary on Moses Mendelssohn's striving for a modernized Judaism that his own two daughters and his son, the father of the composer, Felix Mendelssohn, became converts to Christianity.* His daughter, Dorothea, and two other converted women, Rahel von Ense and Henriette Herz, established elegant salons for famous men in which an elite of generals, princes, philosophers poets, scientists and beautiful women gathered for interminable and elevating discussions and also, of course, to see and be seen. How far this trend toward submersion of religious and group identity went on among cultured German Jews may be gathered from the remarkable proposal made to a Christian clergyman in 1799 by Mendelssohn's principal lieutenant, David Friedlander. The latter announced that he was ready to accept baptism for himself and

> his entire circle provided the Church would not oblige them to accept all the "historical" dogmas and doctrines of Christianity such as the Holy Trinity and the Immaculate Conception. The clergyman berated Friedlander for being a hypocrite.*

Let this serve as an object lesson and a warning to our would-be modernist Muslims! Moses Mendelssohn was to the Jews of 18th century Germany what Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan, the founder of the Aligarh Movement, was to the Muslims of late 19th century of India, for both these men were engaged in the same task of westernizing as rapidly as possible, their respective communities. Surely Moses Mendelssohn would have found himself at home in Aligarh! Had these pioneers of Jewish and Muslim modernism lived at the same time and known each other, they could have been comrades-in arms for they had everything in common. The fate of the modernist movement of the Jews in Germany proves conclusively that no such watered-down, insipid, half-hearted faith which compromises with philosophies irreconcilable to it, can ever hope to maintain the allegiance, much less the loyalty of its adherents.

> While some leading Jewish intellectuals became converts to Christianity to escape their pariah status, to pursue some cherished career or just chameleon-like, to blend with the rest of the world, others left the Jewish community because they found it too circumscribing. In the eighteenth century, contemporary with Moses Mendelossohn, were a handful of such free, inquiring minds. Solomon Maimon was one of the most eminent German philosophers of his day and the

**Pictorial History of the Jewish People*, Nathan Ausbel, op. cit., pp. 159, 160.

principal critic of Immanuel Kant. Maimon was a prodigy of erudition in the Talmud. While living in a small Lithuanian town, he became a rabbi at an extremely early age. But his love of learning and his questioning mind gave him no peace. He ran away to Germany from the ghetto which he hated and despite many hardships, within only ten years made an arresting debut in German philosophy. Excepting Goethe, there were no more illustrious figures in German literature during the first half of the nineteenth century than Karl Ludwig Boerne and Heinrich Heine. Heine, the greatest lyric poet Germany had produced, and Boerne, the ardent champion of an unfettered Germany, were men with a universal vision. Though both fought for Jewish rights, they conceived the fight only as part of the struggle for human rights. Bismarck seemed to have had an affinity for Jewish counselors. Undoubtedly the most able and the most reactionary of these statesmen was Friedrich Julius Stahl. An apostate from Judaism, he served as Bismarck's political adviser. He coined the cynical battle cry of the Junkers ; "Not majority but authority!" He has frequently been described by historians of his epoch as the intellectual father of the latter-day Prussianism.*

Friedrich Julius Stahl could with equal justification claim to be a forerunner of the Nazi movement. Adolf Hitler, the most fanatic persecutor of Jews in all history, must certainly have been deeply indebted to him !

At the opposite political pole from Stahl stood **Karl Marx** whose wealthy father had him baptized at the age of six in the belief that Karl's course through life would thereby be made smoother. It is generally held, even by his opponents, **that no man in modern times has influenced the course of history so profoundly as did Karl Marx with his**

**Ibid.*, pp. 160-163.

> **political and economic philosophy.** His theories, based on a materialistic conception of history, were evolved in collaboration with Friedrich Engels, a non-Jew. Marxism as a world-force achieved its greatest importance when it became the cornerstone of the social system of the Soviet Union and in more recent years, of its communistically oriented allies in Europe and Asia.*

This was the result of Mendelssohn's modernist movement! These men may have been among my illustrious ancestors. I an not proud of them.

In their zeal to modernize Judaism, liberal Jews introduced into their houses of worship the organ and other musical instruments, mixed paid professional choirs of men and women (many of them Christians) and replaced the traditional chants of the Hebrew liturgy with the melodies of Christian hymns set to different words which would not offend a Jewish audience. Stain-glass windows bearing paintings of the prophets and patriarchs were another innovation by the reformed Jews to make their houses of worship more nearly resemble a Christian church. The segregation of men and women, so strictly enforced by the Orthodox, was removed and in reformed temples women were "emancipated" and sat in pews alongside the men. Portions of the traditional Hebrew prayers which conflict with modern Western liberalism were removed from the reformed prayer-book, including all reference to the Day of Judgment, Heaven and Hell. Hebrew was replaced by German in Germany and English in America.

**Ibid.*, p. 163.

There is no such thing as "Orthodoxy", they declared, because:

1. There is no authority to decide what is orthodox and what is not.
2. Our codes of law have never been recognized as official and authentic interpretations of Judaism ;
3. Our Torah and Talmud contain superstitious views which are untenable;
4. Our Scriptures presuppose that the fundamental views of modern science are false ;
5. Our ritual practices are impracticable in contemporary society;
6. In many instances, ritual provokes feelings by deceit and trickery ;
7. Dogmas, like all human knowledge, must be revised and enlightened by enlarged experience.*

"The primary source of Reformist ideology is the declaration of principles adopted at the Pittsburg convention of the Central Conference of American Rabbis held in 1885. Owing to the apathy of the laity to all questions concerning theological beliefs, these rabbis enjoy considerable freedom in expounding whatever views they choose so long as they draw large attendance and help increase the membership of their "temples." All this however does not negate the fact that Reformed Judaism has definite norms and that these norms were clearly defined in the principles

*Quoted from *Modern Orthodaxy,* Gotthard Deutsch, Chicago, 1898, p. 26.

of the Pittsburg conference : We quote the complete text of the manifesto of Reformism as follows :

1. We recognize in every religion an attempt to grasp the Infinite and in every mode, source or book of revelation held sacred in any religious systems, the consciousness of the indwell ng of God in man. We hold that Judaism presents the highest conception of the God-idea as taught in our Holy Scriptures and developed and spiritualized by the Jewish teachers in accordance with the moral and philosophical progress of their respective ages. We maintain that Judaism preserved and defended amidst continual struggles and trials and under enforced isolation, this God-idea as the central religious truth for human race.

2. We recognize in the Bible the record of the consecration of the Jewish people to its mission as the priest of the one God and value it as the most potent instrument of religious and moral instruction. We hold that the modern discoveries of scientific research in the domain of nature and history are not antagonistic to the doctrines of Judaism, the Bible reflecting the primitive ideas of its own age and at times clothing its conception of divine Providence and justice dealing with man in miraculous narratives.

3. We recognize in the Mosaic legislation a system of training the Jewish people for its mission during its national life in Palestine and today we accept as binding only its moral law, and maintain only such ceremonies as elevate and sanctify our lives, but reject all such as are not adapted to the views and habits of modern civilization.

4. We hold that all such Mosaic and rabbinical laws as regulate diet, priestly purity, and dress originated in ages and under the influence of ideas, entirely foreign to our present mental and spiritual state. They fail to impress the modern Jew with a spirit of priestly holiness;

their observance in our days is apt rather to obstruct than to further modern spiritual elevation.

5. We recognize in Judaism a progressive religion, ever striving to be in accord with the postulates of reason. We are convinced of the utmost of preserving the historical identity with our great past. Christianity and Islam, being daughter religions of Judaism, we appreciate their providential mission to aid in the spreading of monotheistic and moral truth. We acknowledge that the spirit of broad humanity of our age is our ally in the fulfilment of our mission and therefore we extend the hand of fellowship to all who cooperate with us in the establishment of the reign of truth and righteousenss among men.
6. We assert the doctrine of Judaism that the soul is immortal, grounding this belief on the divine nature of the human spirit which forever finds bliss in righteousness and misery in wickedness. We reject as ideas not rooted in Judaism the beliefs both in bodily resurrection and in Hell and Paradise as abodes for everlasting punishment and reward.
7. We recognize in the modern era of universal culture of heart and intellect, the approaching of the realization of Israel's great Messianic hope for the establishment of the kingdom of truth, justice and peace among all men. We consider ourselves no longer a nation but a religious community and therefore expect neither a return to Palestine nor a sacrificial worship under the sons of Aaron nor the restoration of any of the laws concerning the Jewish state.
8. In full accordance with the spirit of Mosaic legislation which strives to regulate the relations between rich and poor, we deem it our duty to participate in the great task mission of modern times—to solve on the basis of justice and righteousness, the problem presented by the economic contrasts and evils of the present organization of society.

Says Rabbi Mordecai Kaplan, a revered leader of American Jewry, in his classic, Judaism as a civilization, Macmillan, New York, 1934:

> The success of the Reformist movement is qualified not only by its uncertain practical prospect but also by its present spiritual poverty. *It is confined to one stratum of society – the so-called upper middle class.* Since the prerequsites to the proper functioning of Reformist Judaism are magnificent temples, highly paid rabbis, and expensive choirs, the large mass of wage-earners stand outside its pale. To be sure, while nothing in its program makes this snobbery indispensable, nothing in its program suggests a fitting substitute. Traditional Judaism still, impels sweat-shop workers in the cities, poor farmers and bus drivers in farm villages to establish congregations and make provision for the religious upbringing of their children. Reformist Judaism, on the other hand, seems to be limited to those who are comfortably situated. By fostering congregational affiliation, it no doubt helps its aderents to live up to the convential moral standards and to keep alive a sense of communal responsibility, however limited, without such affiliation to prevent the horizon of their interests from being limited to their own immediate family and friends, there is no telling how spiritually callous they might become. But beyond being the mainstay of respectability for a very limited class of Jews, Reformist Judaism has stimulated no intellectual or moral activity of a high order.*

"In the last analysis, submission to Jewish law is the most essential requirement of traditional Judaism. Thus it is fair to inquire: how far is submission to Jewish law a reality in the practice of modern Orthodoxy ?, *We are amazed to discover that the most important elements of Jewish law are as obsolete in modern*

***Ibid.*, p. 111.

*Orthodoxy as they are in Reformism!* Neo-Orthodoxy accepts with utter complacency the elimination of the whole civil code of Jewish law and is content to confine the scope of Jewish law to ritual observance. Neo-Orthodoxy's acceptance of modern Western civilization has been no less glad-hearted than Reformism's. Which is to say that Neo-Orthodoxy in effect has suffered no more qualms than has Reformism about the whole extirpation of the civil code from the law of God. When these laws cease to function, they cease to be studied. Once fundamental in the equipment of the rabbi, the entire code of civil law has practically fallen into neglect. It is truly amazing that the Neo-Orthodox constantly express inconsolable sorrow over the loss of the sanctuary of the Temple in Jerusalem and the disappearance of the sacrificial system yet there is never a word about the rejection of the civil code and no thought of how much the modern Jew has lost of his Jewishness by having it eliminated from his life. To quote the following foreword from the Vilna edition of the *Shulhan Aruk* printed just before World War I :

> Everyone knows that many of the laws contained in these volumes are not actually observed in our time, such laws as pertain to buying and selling, larceny, lost articles, inheritance, oaths, testimony, corporal punishment, usury, fines, excommunication, collection of debts, etc. All those laws were in vogue in the past but are not at present. In all the aforementioned matters we conduct ourselves according to the laws of the various countries which afford us protection. We must bear in mind and obey the Talmudic decision that the law of the Government is law*

**Judaism as a Civilization*, Mordecai Kaplan, pp. 157-158,

During the regime of Kemal Ataturk, the modernizers of Turkey attempted to imitate what the reformed Jews in America had done :

> The new faculty of Divinity at Istanbul University was intended to serve as the centre of a new, modernized and scientific form of religious instruction more appropriate to a secular, westernized republic. In 1928 the faculty appointed a committee to examine the problems of reform and modernization in the Islamic religion and to make proposals through the University to the Ministry of Education. Its report, published in June 1928, begins with a clear assertion that religion is a social institution and like other social institutions, it must keep pace with change and development. The recommendations of the committee were grouped under four headings. The first, "the form of worship" speaks of the need for "clean and orderly mosques **with pews** and cloakrooms. **People must be urged to enter into them with clean SHOES."** The second on the language of worship insists that *this must be Turkish and that* **the prayers and sermons must never be in Arabic** *but in the national language.* The third on the charecter of worship "seeks to make the mosque worship beautiful, inspiring and spiritual. For this **the mosque needs trained musicians and also musical instrumments.** The need is urgent for modern vocal and instrumental music in the mosque". The fourth and last deals with the thought-side of worship. "Printed set sermons must be replaced by religious guidance which only preachers with the necessary philosophical training would be competent to give."*

It is equally significant that Bernard Lewis is a Jewish scholar who applauds these reforms. This deplorable hypocrisy deceived none of the Muslims in Turkey who, despite their tyrannical secularist regime,

*The Emergence of Modern Turkey, Bernard Lewis, Oxford University Press, London, 1961, p. 408.

remained as devout and sincere as their brethren-in-faith elsewhere. Thus this half-hearted Government attempt to reform the mosque on the pattern of the modern Protestant Christian Church ended as a miserable failure. In contrast, the Jews succumbed to modernization much more swiftly and completely than anything known in the Muslim world where the common people want none of it and thus all measures for westernization must be forcibly imposed from above. As a result, the "reformed" Jews have their own "temples" where any remnant of traditional ritual is merely retained for sentimental reasons. The "conservative" Jews form another group and go to their separate synagogues which also part with much of the Tradition as valid only for ancient times, though not nearly so radically as the "liberals". Only in the Orthodox "*shul*" is the complete law and ritual retained intact. Although the Jews will emphatically deny this, the reformed, conservative and orthodox Jews form three distinct sects, each possessing separate houses of worship and their own educational institutions for the training of future rabbis.

> Just as Martin Luther broke down the barriers of dogma in Christianity and progressive Jewry has sought to bring a reformed Judaism to the Jews, so also liberal Islam must be recognized and given its place by the orthodox.*

Thank God, this has not, cannot and *inshallah* will never happen to us! If Mr. Fyzee ever wants to say his *Salat*, he is compelled to worship side by side with his orthodox, "unenlightened" brother!

**A Modern Approach to Islam,* Asaf A. Fyzee, op. cit., p. 107.

Is orthodox Judaism and modern Western culture compatible? The answer to this question can be found in a very instructive little book entitled *Two Worlds*, published in 1956 in New York by David Daiches, now a prominent critic of English literature. The subject of this book is a biography of his father who as Chief Rabbi of Edinburgh (Scotland) devoted his entire life in the attempt to prove both to himself and to orthodox Jews throughout the Western world, that it is possible for the Jew to maintain his piety and strict observance of the sacred law intact while at the same time fully participating in modern life. Although he did manage with much difficulty to attain a small measure of success in this respect in his own life, he was unable to transmit his deep religious faith to his children who, educated in secular public schools, were irresistibly attracted to the surrounding environment and all grew up as atheists

My father in his innocence took much for granted. Most of all, he took for granted that the deep unmentioned roots of his own faith would spread automatically down the generations. He, as an orthodox Jewish rabbi and a student of Hume and Kant, had finally solved the relation between Judaism and modern secular culture and showed how one could be a free and equal citizen of a Western democracy while keeping up all orthodox Jewish observances. There was nothing for Lionel and me to do but to follow in his footsteps. Though he never thought of us as becoming rabbis, I don't think that it once crossed his mind that we would ever question his cultural synthesis. And throughout our childhood, the pattern of family loyalties and family affection was woven so closely and strongly that any such questioning was unthinkable. Even when as a child, I used to wonder about the existence of God, it never occurred to

me to wonder about my father's British-Jewish way of life. (pp. 178-179)......

The change which resulted in my life when I left school and entered Edinburgh University was enormous and had far-reaching consequences. As a schoolboy I had done my work and gone home, taking no part in sports or other extracurricular activities. But the university was different. There was a great variety of social and intellectual life outside the lecture room. The sense of liberation was intoxicating. I had not realized how narrow and lonely my life had previously been. But now I was free in a new and vastly richer world, and not only free in it but sought after by it.

To my father, it was inconceivable that I should take a non-Jewish girl for an outing. Indeed, it was inconceivable to him that Lionel or I should take ANY girl, even one of deep Jewish orthodoxy, out to tea or anywhere else. The Daiches boys didn't do that. We were the sons of a prominent rabbi and we were not to be seen going about with a girl. When the time came, my father intended to introduce us to beautiful, intelligent and wealthy Jewish girls from cities which had larger Jewish populations than Edinburgh and he assumed we would then get married. If we did not like the first ones provided, there would be others. Here again, my father's innocence was shattering. What would he have thought if he knew that I had been walking my girl home from the university every day? For the first time in my life I was exploring friendship and found the invisible barrier imposed by the policy of Jewish self-segregation not only phsyically impossible but a great strain psychologically. Oddly enough, my father never forbade me to go to university dances whatever his private misgivings might have been. But it was unthinkable that we should take a girl to a dance we attended. We should go as a member of a large party where the couples were not paired off. What my father thought we did at these dances, I cannot imagine. The difficulty, if not the sheer impossibility,

of going to a dance alone never seems to have occurred to him. (pp. 180-182).

As far as Jewish matters went, I have the impression now that my youngest sister, Beryl, was from the beginning further away from the older tradition than the rest of us. Not that there was any visible difference in the Jewish atmosphere of our home when she was a child—the same rituals, the same festivals, the same observances. But though Beryl was naturally taught Hebrew, I don't think she was drilled in Jewish matters the way we were and there were all sorts of little freedoms which Lionel, Sylvia and I had bit by bit wrested from our parents which she grew up to take completely for granted. She participated more fully in school life than the rest of us ever did and she relaxed her strict observance of the Sabbath at an earlier age and I should imagine, with less inward argument than the rest of us. I suppose it was World War II and the conditions of life in a uniformed service that helped Beryl to cast off all Jewish religious observance with such casual indifference that she did not even seem to take notice that she was doing it. When living with Mother, she made no attempt to conceal her utter indifference to Jewish observance which we were brought up to practice. The rest of us at least kept things up when we were at home in Edinburgh but Beryl had her older sister, Sylvia's hatred of hypocrisy and refused on principle to observe customs that had no meaning for her. She had moved in the same direction as I for one had but much more quickly and with apparently no sentimental memories of Jewish life in the days of our childhood. In the light of her wartime experiences alone with her preoccupied parents in a grimly "utility" Edinburgh, she had come to associate all Jewish observance with restriction and dreariness. Am I blaming her for having put the past behind her too easily when I did so only after such mental agony? (pp. 147-149).

It may seem surprising that my father, who was so anxious to combine all that was best in modern thought with Jewish

tradition and practice, should have been so opposed to liberal reformed Judaism whose aim is to concentrate on the finer ethical qualities of Judaism and prune away the element of tribal taboo and rabbinical elaboration of the minute prohibitions and observances. But in fact, he was the implacable enemy of the movement. In his view, to tailor Judaism in that fashion meant to substitute human claims to know what was good and right and to be able to distinguish the ethically relevant from the archaic for a belief in the divine origin of Jewish ethics. (pp. 174-175). My father demonstrated the illogicality of the Reformed Jewish position for me conclusively. If the individual can pick and choose among the Biblical precepts saying that some sound rather attractive and worth keeping while others seem primitive and superstitious, then obviously he is creating God in accordance with his own ideas and the objective Truth of religion disappears. Any kind of "liberal" religion becomes a humane agnosticism using some of the forms of religion to find acceptance for its ethical views. I discuss this in some detail because it explains how my father unwittingly destroyed for me in advance any line of defence to which I might retreat when I came to doubt the literal Divine inspiration of the Bible and the Talmud. It is a sad irony of fate that made my father's earnest and eloquent crusade against Reformed Judaism point the way to agnosticism for me but that is what happened. (pp. 174-178).

Yet the story of my father is tragic only if we read it too literally. True, his synthesis of Jewish orthodoxy with modern Western culture, however brilliantly illustrated in his own life, proved incapable of transmission to his children. His ultimate recognition of this was perhaps rueful rather than either complacent or tragic. But he went on with his mission to the end, pursuing his chosen way of life with heroic dignity. (p. 192).*

*_Two Worlds: A Jewish Childhood in Edinburgh_, David Daiches, Harcourt Brace & Co., New York, 1956.

I heartily recommend the whole of this book as an eye-opener to all Muslim parents who must face the problem of raising their children in non-Muslim societies because the lesson it preaches is just as applicable to us.

How does the process of westernization/modernization proceed ? What are the attractions of modern life so irresistible to the rising generations reared in traditional societies which result in rejection of "traditionalism" with such vehemence ? It is the same story all over the world. Here is an illuminating excerpt from the autobiography of a Russian-Jewish girl who migrated with her family to America at the end of the last century.

> One day I found myself in the middle of the schoolyard with a dozen of my Christian classmates interrupting each other to express their disapproval of me. For I had just cooly told them in answer to a question that I did not believe in God.
>
> How had I arrived at such a conviction? How had I come from praying, fasting and Psalm-singing, to this extreme impiety? Alas! My backsliding had cost me no travail of spirit. Always weak in my faith, playing at piety as I played at soldiers, just as I was in the mood or not, I had neglected my books of devotion and given myself up to profane literature at the first opportunity in Vitebsk; and I never took up my prayer book again. On my return to my native Polotzk, America loomed so near that my imagination was fully occupied, and I did not revive the secret experiments with which I used to test the nature and intention of Diety. **It meant more to me that I was going to America than I would not be going to Paradise.** And when we joined my father there, and I saw that he did not wear the sacred fringes nor did he put on his phylacteries and pray, I was neither surprised nor shocked, remembering the

Sabbath night when he had committed with no remorse or shame the grave sin of turning off the lamp with his own hand. When I saw him go out to work on Sabbath exactly as on a week-day, I understood why God had not annihilated me with his thunderbolt that time when I purposely carried something in my pocket in violation of the Sabbath; there was no God and there was no sin. And joyfully I ran out to play, delighted to find that I was free like all the non-Jewish children in the street, instead of being imprisoned with prohibitions, restrictions and obligations at every step.

The actual point of issue in the schoolyard was as little as ever to me but I perceived that a crowd of free American children were disputing the right of a fellow citizen to have kind of god she chose. I knew from my father's teaching that this persecution was contrary to the Constitution of the United States of America and I held my ground as befitted the defender of a cause. George Washington would not have treated me as Kitty Maloney was doing! "This is a free country!" I reminded them in the middle of the argument. When the school bell rang and the children began to file into their classroom, my teacher, Miss Bland, listened patiently to my version of the story. She said she was sorry that the children had been rude to me but she thought they would not trouble me any more if I let the subject drop. She made me understand, as Miss Dillingham had done on the occasion of my making noise during prayers, that it was proper American conduct to avoid religious arguments on school territory. I felt honoured by this private initiation into the doctrine of Secularism—of the strict separation of Church and State and I went to my seat in the classroom with dignity, my conscience fully satisfied by my teacher's calm explanation.

My father, in his ambition to make Americans of us, was headstrong and strenuous in his methods. To my mother, on the eve of departure from Russia to the New World, he wrote boldly that progressive American Jews did not spend their days in praying and he urged her to leave her

wig in Polotzk as a first step of progress. The breath of revolt against Orthodox Traditionalism was at that time beginning to reach us ghetto Jews in Polotzk from the greater outside world, notably from America. Sons whose pious parents had impoverished themselves by paying the fine for non-appearance for military conscription in order to save their loved-ones from the inevitable sins of violated Jewish laws, while in the service, proudly sent home photographs of themselves in modern dress with their faces shaved and the grieved old fathers and mothers after offering up special prayers for the renegades and giving charity in their name, exhibited the significant portraits on their parlor tables. Bred to blind submission to her father and then to her husband, submit she must and when my mother perceived a conflict of authorities, she was prepared to accept the New Order under which her children's future was to be formed without question; wherein she proved her adaptability, her readiness to fall into line, which is one of the most charming traits of her gentle, self-effacing nature. My father held it to be his wife's duty to follow her husband in all things. Convinced that to adhere to Orthodox Judaism was to be hampered in the race for Americanization, he did not hesitate to order our family life on the new lines. There was no deliberate despotism in this; it was only making manly haste to realize the ideal, the nobility of which there was nobody to dispute. My father had always been a free-thinker and a non-conformist in his heart; my mother bore lovingly the yoke of prescribed Jewish conduct. Individual freedom to him was the only tolerable condition of life; to my mother it meant confusion. If my father's loud bold denials of the existence of God influenced her to reconsider her creed, it was merely an incidental result of the freedom of expression we enjoyed in America which he was so eager to practice after a life-time of enforced hypocrisy in the ghetto. My father allowed my mother to believe and worship as she pleased up to the point where her orthodoxy began to interfere with the Americanization of the family. Although

my father allowed my mother to keep a *Kosher* kitchen, he did not want us children to refuse invitations to the dining tables of our Gentile neighbors. He would have no bar to our social intercourse with the world around us for only by freely sharing the life of our non-Jewish neighbors could we come into our full inheritage of American freedom and opportunity. On the High Holy Days he brought my mother a ticket for the synagogue services but we children went to school. On Sabbath eve my mother might light the consecrated candles but my father kept his store open until Sunday morning. The price that all of us paid for this disorganization of our family life has been levied on every immigrant Jewish household where the first generation clings to Traditionalism while the new generation leads a modern life. Nothing more pitiful or pathetic than this Emancipation could be written in the history of the Jews yet nothing more hopeful. **For Israel is not the only party that has put up a forfeit in this struggle between medievalism and modernism—the whole of humanity has a vital stake it!** And I speak for thousands, if not millions!

My conscience was not troubled when I horrified my Christian classmates in the school yeard by denying the existence of God on the authority of my father and defended my right to atheism on the authority of the Constitution of the United States of America. I considered myself then as I do now, absolutely, eternally delightfully emancipated from the yoke of indefensible superstitions. I went wild with indignation and pity when I remembered how my poor brother had been cruelly beaten because he did not want to sit in the Cheder and accept the authority of the Talmud which was, after all, false and useless. I was intoxicated with my love for Enlightenment and eager for opportunities to prove it.

It was my teacher, Miss Dillingham who put me to an early test when she invited me to tea one day and I came in much trepidation. It was my first entrance into a genuine American household; my first meal at a Gentile—yes a

Christian board. Would I know how to behave properly? I do not know whether I betrayed my anxiety ; I am certain only that I was all eyes and ears, that nothing should escape me which might serve to guide me in the future. This, after all, was a normal state for me as a newly arrived immigrant. So I suppose I looked natural no matter how much I stared. America was not Polotzk, as my father repeatedly reminded me, so I proceeded very cautiously with my spoons, knives and forks at the table, trying to conceal my uncertainty by being just a bit slow. I did not get to any given spoon until the others at table had shown me which was the correct one. All went well until a platter was passed with a kind of meat which was strange to me. Some mischievous instinct told me that it was ham—forbidden food : and I, the athiest, the liberal, the Enlightened and the Free, was afraid to touch it. I had a terrible moment of surprise, mortification, self-contempt but I helped myself to the slice of the forbidden swine-flesh nevertheless and hung my head over my plate to hide my confusion; I was furious with myself for my weakness ; I to be afraid of a pink piece of pig's flesh, who had defied at least two religions in defence of free thought. And then I boldly helped myself to a larger second portion, determined to eat more ham than anybody else at the table! Alas! I learned that to eat in defence of principles was not so easy as to talk. That Spartan boy who allowed the stolen fox hidden in his bosom to consume his vitals rather than be detected in the theft, showed no such miracle of self-control as did I sitting there at my friend's tea-table eating un-Jewish meat! And to think that so ridiculous a thing as a scrap of meat should be the symbol and test of things so august! To think that in the mental life of a half-grown child should be reflected the struggles and triumphs of ages ! (pp. 240-251).

Our initiation into American ways began with the first steps on the new soil. When I enumerate the long list of my American school teachers. I must begin with those who

came to us on Wall Street and taught us our first steps. A fairy godmother to us children was she who led us to a wonderful country called "uptown" where in a dazzingly beautiful palace called a "department store" we exchanged our hateful home-made Russian-Jewish costumes which pointed us out as "greenhorns" to the children who ridiculed us on the street for the real beautiful American machine-made garments and issued forth glorified in each other's eyes. With our despised foreign clothing, was also shed our impossible Hebrew names. A committee of our friends, several years ahead of us in American experience, put their heads together and concocted English names for us all. (pp. 187-188).

Perhaps I had spent my time in the city of Vitebsk to better advantage for when I returned to my native village I saw the narrowness, the stifling narrowness, the provincialism and poverty of my restricted life in Polotzk. My secular books, my walks, my visits as teacher to many homes had been so many doors opening on a wider world, so many horizons, one beyond the other. The boundaries of life had stretched and I filled my lungs with the thrilling air from the world Outside. Child though I was, Polotzk was too small for me. My spirit is not tied to the monumental past, any more than my feet are bound to my grandfather's little house below the hill. The past was only my cradle; and now it cannot hold me because I am grown too big; just as my little house in Polotzk, once my home in which I was born, has now become a toy of memory; as I move without restraint in the wide open spaces of this splendid palace of America! Hark to the clamour of urban America, my new home which invites me to the glad new life! In that moment I had a vision of myself emerging from the dim places where the torch of civilization had never been, creeping slowly towards Enlightenment, pushing, then climbing more steadily forward to the broad plateau of modern life and then leaping at last, strong and

> confident to the intellectual heights of the twenteith century! (p. 364)*

Muslim minorities in non-Muslim lands are rapidly losing their cultural and religious identity, so that the children know nothing about Islam except for the fact that they were born into Muslim families. The extent to which this assimilation has proceeded is illustrated in the following story:

> The other day I was speaking to a Muslim child about eight years old and brought up in a reasonably good Muslim home in America. He was trving to draw something. I took his crayons and sketched a mosque—dome, minarets and all. I asked him what it was? "*A birthday cake!*" came the quick reply.**

This is sufficient evidence that the Muslim parent has no more hope than the orthodox Jewish parent of raising his children to follow him in the irreligious atmosphere of the modern world. David Daiches' biography of his father is a convincing proof that it is impossible to maintain sincere loyalty and full participation in two conflicting cultures at one and the same time. For centuries Jews faced this problem and solved it successfully by establishing their autonomous, self-sufficient communities which provided for their every need. So long as the Jew remained in the ghetto, he preserved his religious and cultural identity intact, but as soon as the ghetto disintegrated, the process of assimilation into the prevailing way of

**The Promised Land*, Mary Antin, Houghton Miffin Co., New York, 1912.

**"Islam in the West", al-Maghribi, *The Radiance Views-Weekly*, Delhi, December 31, 1967, p. 25.

life of the majority ran its inevitable course until today most Jews are thus only nominally.

If Muslims living in a materialistic environment wish to preserve their faith for succeeding generations, they have no choice but to follow the example of the medieval Jews and organize their own communities. They must establish (as the Jews have done) their own schools for their children, their own philanthropic organizations, their own shops to make *Halal* foods easily available and also set up their own commercial enterprises to provide adequate employment opportunities.

In one crucial respect, however, these Muslim communities should differ from the Ghetto. **The traditional Jewish community was always a closed society,** saturated because of persecution and discrimination with pessimism and despair. In contrast, the atmosphere of the Muslim community should be filled with optimism. It should relentlessly carry on vigorous missionary activity to make Muslims strong in personal conviction and idealism rather than mere habit, custom and tradition and enthusiastically welcome outsiders to join, always with the hope that this dynamic, expanding group, maintaining strong contact with Muslims elsewhere, might some day become a majority in the land and eventually establish genuine Islamic state.

It was the *secularist* spirit of the nineteenth century, seeking social solutions in practical terms that saw the rise of the modern Zionist movement. The leaders of the Jewish enlightenment in Russia, for example, ever since the days of Tsar Alexander I, had the confident belief that if only Jews succeeded in becoming as Russian as the

Russians, the Tsarist government would promptly grant them full equality, and the Jewish problem would be solved forever. Their advice was: "We must prepare ourselves for this golden future and take advantage of the opportunities offered us. We must come out of our shell, obtain a secular education and acquire Russian culture! Then all else will follow!" But when in May 1881 the Tsarist government decreed its harsh, anti-Jewish laws and initiated a series of shocking pogroms throughout the empire, the hopes of the assimilationist *Haskalah* evaporated overnight. The first concrete Zionist effort was made by *Rabbi Zvi Hirsch Kalischer* (1795-1870) who wrote pamphlets in which he called for a return to the soil in *Eretz Yisrael.* The majority of religious Jews to whom Rabbi Kalisher addressed himself considered his plan blasphemous since they assumed that the return of Israel to Zion was within the province of the Messiah only. *Rabbi Samuel Mohilever* 1824-1889), a Talmudic scholar and one of the leading Orthodox rabbis of Eastern Europe, was so deeply stirred by the tragedies resulting from the pogroms which convulsed Russia and Poland in 1881, that he issued a call for a mass meeting in Warsaw where the first association of *Hovevei Zion* (The Lovers of Zion) was founded. This was the first Zionist body in history and preceded the World Zionist Organization founded by Theodor Herzl by sixteen years. Rabbi Mohilever is regarded as the real founder of the religious Zionist party, *Mizrachi Hazair.* Leo Pinsker, a leader of the Enlightenment and a believer in assimilation, after he had witnessed the pogrom in Odessa in 1811, came to the conclusion **that the Jews could rely only on themselves for their emancipation.** His pamphlet "*Auto-Emancipation*" became the fervent platform for the *Hovevei Zion* Organization His motto—quoting Rabbi Hillel, the sage of the *Mishnah*—"If I am not for myself, who is for me?" becmse the battle-cry of all the "Lovers of Zion."*

**Pictorial History of the Jewish People,* op. cit., pp., 300-301.

Rabbi Hillel would have been enraged had he known how his famous saying had been torn out of its context to be abused for ends he certainly would not have sanctioned, for the rest of his saying runs as follows: *"If I am for myself alone, who am I?* If not now, when?"

The founder of World Zionism was *Theodor Herzl.* In January 1895 while covering the trial of Captain Alfred Dreyfus (who was falsely accused of treason) in Paris as foreign correspondent of the Viennese *Nue Frie Presse,* he was present at that Jewish officer's degradation on January 5, 1895. This proved the turning point in his life. An assimilationist until then, he experienced a painful emotional crisis when he heard he anti-Semitic mob hooting at the unfortunate Dreyfus, "Death to the Jews!" He gave much thought to the question: "Why should we not help one another and leave this unhappy exile and build for ourselves a free Jewish state?" He sat down in a mood of inner agitation to write his essay, *Der Judenstaat* (The Jewish State) in 1896 in which he presented his well-known program of political Zionism. Theodor Herzl never abandoned his conviction that the best way to achieve the Jewish state was by means of personal diplomacy. It was with an all-consuming passion that he set himself the task of reaching important people—the Pope, kings, ministers of state, bankers and philanthropists. He ruined his health and impoverished his family traveling from one capital to another, trying to win support for his plan among the influential. These efforts were directed to but one end—to obtain a legal charter for a Jewish State in Palestine from Sultan Abdul Hamid II, then the Turkish ruler of Palestine.*

Theodor Herzl offered Abdul Hamid II any amount of money he wanted if he would only relinquish Palestine to the Jews but the Sultan was perhaps the only

**Ibid.*, pp. 300-303).

Muslim ruler at that time who regarded the integrity of Islamic territory before his own personal gain and thus refused to be bribed. **He correctly predicted that only after the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire could the Jews have Palestine!** For this steadfastness, the Jews and their sympathizers, especially in Britain, rewarded him with a violent campaign of slander and vilification which ultimately deposed him in 1908 with the triumph of the Freemason controlled party known as the "Young Turks". It is not too far-fetched to assume a definite relationship between the machinations of this propaganda and the rise of Mustafa Kemal Ataturk who abolished the Khalifate in 1924. Here in Theodor Herzl's own words is the Zionist conspiracy against Islam :

> Supposing His Majesty, the Sultan were to give us Palestine, we could in return undertake to regulate the whole finances of Turkey. We should therefore form a portion of the rampart of Europe against Asia; an outpost of Western civilization as opposed to barbarism. We should as a natural State remain in contact with all Europe which would have to guarantee our existence.*

As one American Christian university Professor aptly describes the philosophical sources of Zionism:

> Zionism is essentially a naturalistic movement. It developed first in Eastern Europe among the revolutionary Jewish intelligentsia who had abandoned the culture of the ghetto and taken up nihilism and Socialism. They idealized agricultural work as an emancipating way of life and believed that only in Palestine could the Jewish

**The Jewish State*, Theodor Herzl, H. Pordes London, 1967, p. 50.

enlightenment establish real roots and a meaningful existence. In 1862 the ex-Marxist, Moses Hess, published the earliest Hegelian interpretation of Jewish history. The inspiration behind his *Rome and Jerusalem* was not Judaism but the dialectical determinism of German idealist philosophy. He envisioned the Jewish people as a historical type destined to provide the world with an example of social harmony which they could do once they had been re-established as a nation in Palestine. In a basic sense, it defined Israel very much as Hegel defined the German people; the main difference was in terminology and selection. And so, Hegel's "synthesis" in which the modern Germans were primary catalyst was reconstucted by Hess as the "Sabbath of History" with the Jews as the agent of becoming. Later in the century, Theodor Herzl developed an even more profane approach to the Jewish question. As a non-religious and highly cosmopolitan Jew, he was concerned to open a door to the comprehensive "emancipation" of the Iews. For Herzl this door was "normalization." He tried many keys, including a vague scheme of mass-conversion to the Roman Catholic Church. Ultimately, he settled on the idea of Jewish nationalism. In an age of intense nationalistic orientation, the building up of a Jewish nation seemed an appropriate means of normalizing the Jewish people and giving them a place in the world. From the very start, he saw himself as the leader of a Jewish *avant-guarde* whose mission was to transform a people. "I conduct the affairs of the Jews without their mandate," he asserted in his diary. To achieve his aim, Herzl constructed a hierarchical organization. The upper echelon, "the family council" established in Jewish centres throughout the world would also be briefed on the general scheme after being sworn to secrecy. It would then be instructed to select a third echelon to which the plan of organized emigration from Europe to Palestine would be revealed without at first any mention of a state. The Jewish masses were to be manipulated by this elite organi-

zation and once they had arrived in the territory of the projected state, they would be recruited into labour battalions along military lines, their training involving a nationalistic indoctrination buttressed by patriotic songs and heroic theatrical plays. As a secularist, Herzl did not have any particular attachment to Palestine as the site of the projected state ; he considered parts of the Argentine, the Sinai peninsula and Cyprus more practicable. But at the crucial Basle congress in 1897 he became aware of the Eastern European contingent's preference for Palestine. He recognized that Palestine would have an appeal for many Jews to whom the idea of a Jewish state was an alien and even a suspect concept. So he endorsed Palestine as the site of the future state.*

An accurate insight into the nature of the Zionist movement can be achieved by a glimpse of the character of its founder, based on excerpts from his famous diary, which shows him to be a purely materialistically-minded opportunist guided by no moral precepts except expediency:

Of course Dr, Theodor Herzl badly wanted to secure Palestine as a homeland for the Jewish people. But he made up his mind in spite of the stubborn and "benighted" Russian-Polish Jews that in case he could not possibly secure Palestine for them, they would simply have to accept, at least temporarily *some* sort of Jewish homeland, be it in Syria, Sinai, El Arish, Cyprus, Tripoli, Portuguese Mozambique, the Belgian Congo, Uganda, in any one of these territories for which he was always "negotiating." To this end Herzl roamed about Europe from one capital to another, from one royal court to another, from one scheme to another. Sometimes he used his position as correspondent of the Vienna *Neue Freie Presse*, a position that opened

*"Zionism and Jewish Humanism," Alan R. Taylor, *The Christian Century*, September 18, 1968, pp. 1164-1167.

most doors to him. Sometimes he used his position as head of the Zionist organization.

Herzl's methods were simple. He explained it all thus in his diary on May 12, 1898 : "Noise is everything! In truth, noise amounts to a great deal. A sustained noise is in itself a noteworthy pact. World history is nothing but noise; noise of arms and of advancing ideas. Men must put noise to use!"

A typically great political achievement was a letter Theodor Herzl secured, or, may we say, extracted, from Plėhve, Minister of Internal Affairs in the Czar's Government. Phleve was the man directly answerable for and undoubtedly the sponsor of the Jewish massacres in Czarist Russia. Herzl craved an audience with the Czar. It was denied him. So, through his agents, he succeeded in securing an audience with the bloody Plehve. Plehve could not help being polite to the correspondent of the *Neue Freie Presse.* He was brutal enough to admit that he had no objection to getting rid of as many Jews as possible; in fact, he would become a "sympathetic" supporter of Zionism. Herzl then proposed that Plehve should write him a letter that he would present before the Zionist congress to the effect that the Zionist movement could count on the "Russian Government's moral and material assistance." Plehve's letter became Herzl's most cherished asset. He carried it around everywhere; he even showed it to the Pope. The murderer of his people had shaken hands with him and talked to him politely. Was that not wonderful?

Another example of the end justifies the means philosophy of Herzl is the story of Chaim Weizmann's pointing out to Herzl that a certain very rich man he was associating with was a fool. To this Herzl answered; "But he opens the portals of royalty to me."

Herzl felt himself observed on every side. He laid great weight on his appearance. Should it this time be gray or black clothes—what kind of gloves, shoes, hat to wear?

Occasionally he carried along with him a clothes brush. The crease of his trousers, the shine of his shoes, the colour of his gloves, are repeatedly mentioned in his diary and the effect they had, in his estimation.

Herzl had great faith that his extortionist secret agent Nevlinsky, would arrange an audience with the Sultan in Constantinople. He went there to await results. Nevlinsky spent plenty of Herzl's money on *baksheesh* all round. But the Sultan refused Herzl. Yet he managed to turn his journey into a political victory along other lines. En route back from Constantinople, it was arranged that he would be welcomed in Sofia, the capital of Bulgaria, by the Jewish community as befitting the man who had just returned from a secret visit to Constantinople. The synagogue in Sofia, was filled with hundreds who came to pay homage to "King Messiah" Herzl. Here is what Herzl entered in his diary on June 29, 1896 : "I stood in the pulpit before the Holy Ark. When I hesitated for a moment as to how to face the congregation without turning my back to the Ark, someone exclaimed; "You may turn your back even to the Ark because you are holier than the Torah!"

Baron Rothschild did not think much of Dr. Herzl. He regarded him as a "demagogue." Western European Jews laughed at Herzl's premise that the Jews were a nation; some even thought that Herzl was mentally unbalanced. On the other hand, East European Jews responded enthusiastically to his call for a world Zionist Congress. Thus encouraged, he issued a call to the Jewish communities to send elected representatives to meet in Basel, Switzerland on a Sunday, August 29, 1897. Ben Ami, a Hebrew writer and *Hovev Zion* described the historic event in these words :

"Before us arose a marvellous and exalted figure, kingly in bearing and stature with deep eyes in which could be read quiet majesty and unuttered sorrow. It is no longer the elegant Dr. Herzl of Vienna; it is royal scion of the House of David risen from among the dead, clothed in legend, fantasy and beauty. Everyone sat breathless, as

if in the presence of a miracle. And in truth was it not a miracle which we beheld? For fifteen minutes the delegates clapped, shouted and waved their handkerchiefs. The dream of two thousand years was on the point of realization; it was as if the Messiah, son of David confronted us; and I was seized by an overpowering desire in the midst of this storm of joy to cry out loudly for all to hear: *Yechi Hamelech*! (Hail to the King!)"

Said Theodor Herzl just before his death in 1904: "I believe that I shall be named in history as among the greatest benefactors of mankind or is this feeling of mine the beginning of delusions of grandeur?"*

Until the rise of the Nazi regime of Adolf Hitler, the Zionist movement could not make much progress even among the Jews. Indeed, in the beginning, Zionism encountered stiff resistance. Those Jews who did not oppose Zionism, mostly regarded it as an impractical dream—a mere visionary, idealistic utopia which could never be realized. Those liberal-minded Jews who believed in assimilation were bitterly opposed to Zionism, because they feared it would jeopardize their status as citizens in the lands of their adoption. The anti-Zionist reformed Jews in America organized *The Amercian Council for Judaism* which still functions at its headquarters in New York. The profoundly orthodox Jews opposed Zionism for entirely different reasons. According to traditional Judaism, only God could forgive the Jews for their sins Who had punished them by exile and persecution and bring His Messiah to gather all the Jews back to the Holy Land. **The Zionists, who violently repudiated tradi-**

**The Decadence of Judaism in our Time*, Moshe Menuhin, Exposition Press, New York, 1965, pp. 39-49 (abridged).

**tional Jewish beliefs and practices to the point of atheism, proclaimed they had no more patience to wait for God's Messiah, whom they doubted would ever come, and decided that the Jews must immediately take matters into their own hands and, entirely through their own efforts, without waiting for or depending upon Divine help, establish their nationalist state in Palestine through the ordinary means of power-politics.** This to the pious orthodox Jew of some fifty years back appeared tantamount to sheer blasphemy! The association of Palestine, and specifically Jerusalem, in the mind of religious Jews was a very different thing from modern Zionism. A well-known convert to Islam of Jewish origin, whose scholarly services to the Islamic cause cannot be doubted, writes :

> Not all Jews living in Palestine at the time (1922) were Zionists. Some of them had come there, not in pursuit of a political aim but out of a religious longing for the Holy Land and its Biblical associations. To this group belonged my Dutch friend, Jacob de Haan—a small, plump, blond-bearded man in his early forties who had formerly taught law at one of the leading universities in Holland and was now a special correspondent of the Amsterdam *Handelstlad* and the London *Daily Express*. A man of deep religious convictions, he did not approve of the idea of Zionism. "We Jews," he said to me on more than one occasion, "were driven away from the Holy Land and scattered all over the world because we had fallen short of the task God had conferred upon us. We had been chosen by Him to preach His word but in our stubborn pride, we began to believe that he had made us a "chosen nation" for our own sake—and thus we betrayed Him.

> Now nothing remains for us but to repent and cleanse our hearts, and when we become worthy once again to be the hearers of His message, He will send a Messiah to lead His servants back to the Promised Land. Do you think that history is but a series of accidents? I don't. It was not without a purpose that God made us lose our land and dispersed us, but the Zionists do not want to admit this to themselves. They suffer from the same spiritual blindness that caused our downfall. The two thousand years of Jewish exile and unhappiness have taught them nothing. Instead of making an attempt to understand the innermost causes of our unhappiness, they now try to circumvent it, as it were, by building a "National Home" on the foundations provided by Western power-politics. In the process of building a national home, they are committing the crime of depriving another people of their home." Jacob de Haan's political views naturally made him most unpopular with the Zionists. Indeed, a short time after I left Palestine, I was shocked to learn that he had been shot dead one night by the terrorists.*

Almost from the outset, the Zionist movement spilt apart into two main factions—the extremists or "political Zionists" and the moderates or "cultural Zionists" who sought only the right for the Jews to settle in Palestine for cultural and spiritual reasons so that a uniquely Jewish culture might flourish. These "cultural Zionists" did not insist upon political sovereignty and repeatedly expressed their willingness to recognize the legal rights of the indigenous Arabs to their homeland. They wanted Palestine to become an independent bi-national state where both Jews and Arabs would participate in the Government on equal terms. They

*The Road to Mecca*, Muhammad Asad (formerly Leopold Weiss) Max Rheinhardt, London, 1954, pp. 98-99.

dreamed of Palestine being transformed into the Switzerland of Western Asia. Their declared policy was the promotion of peaceful cooperation, mutual respect and brotherly feelings with their Arab neighbours. The chief representatives of the "cultural Zionists" were the Russian Jewish philosopher, Achad Ha'am, Professor Martin Buber, the late Dr. Judah Magnus, formerly the Rector of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, and the renowed Jewish mathematician and scientist, Dr. Albert Einstein.

As far back as the 1920's, Achad Ha'am sharply condemned the conduct of the Jewish colonists in the following words :

> ....Yet how do our brethren behave in Palestine ? Persecuted as they were in exile, and suddenly finding themselves free to do as they please, this transformation has awakened in them an inclination to despotism. They treat the Arabs with hostility and cruelty, deprive them of their rights, offend them without cause, and most outrageous, constantly boast of these crimes as virtues and nobody among us opposes these disgraceful actions.*

In the autumn of 1946 at the opening of the academic year of the Hebrew University, Dr. Judah Magnus declared :

> The new Jewish voice speaks from the mouth of guns. This is the new *Torah* from the land of Israel. But is this the true *Torah* of Judaism ? Is this the essence of Jewish morality? The world has been shackled to the madness of physical force. Heaven forbid, that we now shackle Judaism and the people of Israel to this madness, This is pagan Judaism which has tragically conquered such large section of our people here and abroad. All the Jews in

**Am-Scheidewe*, Achad Ha'am, Berlin, 1923, p. 107.

> America share the guilt, even those not in accord with the activities of this pagan leadership but who sit at ease with folded hands. The sinister attempt to freeze all moral sense results in their atrophy.*

In his book condemning the Zionist movement, *Here Goes the Middle East*, Alfred Lilienthal quoted Dr. Albert Einstein's last public statement before his death concerning the State of Israel, spoken in an interview with Dorothy Schiff, pro-Zionist publisher of *The New York Post*. He said, "We had great hopes for Israel at first. We thought Israel might prove itself morally superior to other nations. But it is no better!" (p. 243)

Here is how Moshe Smilansky, himself an old-time Jewish settler in Palestine, criticized the extremists almost a quarter of a century ago.

> The first in the Zionist camp to proclaim the necessity for Palestine as a sovereign Jewish state as fundamental policy were the Revisionists. Formerly only the Revisionist youth were raised in the spirit of chauvinism and militarism which crass ignorance and short-sightedness considered as "nationalism." Today, however, most of our Jewish youth in Palestine are indoctrinated in this spirit. Our youth have learned to think mechanically. Some invisible "unknown, "some "instructor" or "head" pushes a secret button and, lo! —the immature youth's brains begin to spin. The *Haganah* was a pure creation in the beginning, clean of purpose and pure of motive. But the promulgation of the sovereign Jewish State and the preparations that led to it have degraded that organization to the same class as the murderers of the *Irgun*

**For Zion's Sake* (biography of Judah L. Magnus), Norman Bentwich, Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, 1954, p. 188.

*Z'vai Leumi* and the *Stern* Group. Within the Zionist movement, freedom of thought and speech have been banned. Scribes have turned into *Shofars* (horns) trumpeting the slogans dictated from above. Anybody who dares express an opinion of his own is maligned as a traitor and apostate. Writers of any independence have been forced to remain dumb.*

The spokesman for "Cultural Zionism" which in 1942 organized The *Ihud Association of Israel* had this to say about the Palestinian refugees :

We in Israel have no moral right whatever to oppose the return of the Arab refugees to their land and that until we have rectified our sin against the Arab refugees, we have no right to encourage further Jewish immigration. We have no right to demand that American Jews leave their country to which they are happily settled to live on stolen property while the rightful owners of it remain homeless and destitute. We had no right to occupy the house of an Arab if we had not paid for it at its value. The same goes for fields, gardens, stores and workshops. We had no right to build our settlements to realize the dreams of Zionist ambitions on other people's property. To do this is robbery. Political conquest cannot abolish the right of private property. We should bring in fewer Jewish immigrants and use our resources to help the Arab refugees. We here in Israel are faced with this choice : Listen to the voice of truth and morality for the sake of our own good and genuine peace or ignore our consciences and bring evil and misfortune upon us and future generations.**

*Quoted from *The Commentary*, monthly organ of American Jewish Congress, New York, July 1946.

**Quoted from the editorial of *Ner*, the Hebrew monthly of *Ihud*, Jerusalem, December 1955.

Professor Martin Buber expressed his bitter disillusionment with the Zionist movement as follows :

> What I felt sixty years ago when I joined the Zionist movement is essentially what I feel today. I prayed with all my soul that Zionism would never go the way of all other nationalisms—beginning with a great hope and intense idealism and then deteriorating, decaying, becoming collective egoism where the means were considered sufficient justification for the ends as if a collective egoism could be more sacred than the value of the individual. When we returned to Palestine the decisive question was : Do we Jews want to go there as an ally, as a friend, as a brother, as an integral part of the community of Near Eastern peoples or as the representatives of colonialism and imperialism ? This discrepancy between aims and means, between the goal and the way to achieve it, divided the Zionists into opportunists who were determined to grab from the Great Powers as many political concessions as possible and us who simply wanted to be allowed to work in Palestine together wth our Arab neighbors on a plane of equality. It was Hitler who brought us mass immigration and the indispensable necessity to find political sanction for its security. The majority of Jews perferred to learn from Hitler rather than from us. Hitler showed that history does not go the way of the spirit but the way of power and if a people is powerful enough, it can kill with impunity. We made the wrong political entry into Palestine through *Partition*, followed by the war of the Arabs against Partition and against Israel. The question of Arab refugees is decisive for Israel yet so far as I can see, **Israel does not recognize any Arab rights at all.***

The extremists or "political Zionists" found their most important spokesman in Vladimir Jabotinsky, (1880-1940) who was convinced that the Jews could only win political sovereignty in Palestine

**The Jewish Newsletter*, New York, June 2, 1958.

through physical force. More than a half century ago he wrote: "Has it ever been known that any people would willingly surrender its soil ? No more would the Palestine Arabs yield their right to political sovereignty without force!" Jabotinsky organised the *Revisionist* branch of Zionism after the pattern of the Fascist movement then in vogue under Mussolini. The Revisionist youth adopted the Fascist military uniform and the Fascist salute. Jabotinsky's most faithful pupil was Menachem Begin who under the British mandate re-shaped his Revisionist movement into the terrorist *Irgun Z'vai Leumi*, and today is Israel's Prime-Minister.

Here is the credo of Menachem Begin as quoted from his own book, *The Revolt* : The Story of the Irgun, New York, 1948:

> We fight ; therefore we are !
>
> Out of blood, fire, tears and ashes, a new specimen of human being is born, a specimen completely unknown to the world for more than eighteen hundred years—**the fighting Jew!**
>
> First and foremost we must take the offensive! We must attack our enemies without mercy!
>
> With blood and sweat a young generation of Jews shall be reared, proud and strong!

In other words, Menachem Begin was in complete accord with the moto of Mussolini, Hitler and Stalin that "MIGHT IS RIGHT!" A prominent American Rabbi, the leader of the Reformed Jews in America and one time aspirant to the presidency of "Israel"—Abba Hillel Silver of Cleveland declared: "The *Irgun* willgo down in Jewish history as the decisive factor without which the State of Israel would never have come into being."

In 1938, ten years before the state of Israel was established, David Ben-Gurion wrote :

> We are not blind to the fact that Palestine is no void. More than a million Arabs inhabit both sides of the Jordan not since yesterday. There are a million Arabs in Palestine who legitimately regard themselves as its children whether we like it or not. The Arab war against us will be a long one. They do not need to buy land and bring in Arabs from abroad. Everything here is theirs except the Government and it is for the Government they are fighting. The Arabs already possess the land. They need neither laws nor administration to transfer it; *only we do*!*

The extremist group faction is absolutely unscrupulous and will stoop to anything to achieve its ends. Ben-Gurion's own daily *Davar*, the official organ of the *Mapai* (Socialist Labour Party) at Tel-Aviv quoted in the July 11, 1952 issue of the New York Yiddish daily, *Kemper*, suggested the following solution to the problem of motivating mass Jewish immigration to Israel from the West:

> I shall not be ashamed to confess that if I had the power as I have the will, I would carefully select a score of efficient young men devoted to our ideal and burning with the determination to help redeem Jews and I would send them to the countries where Jews are content to remain permanently in sinful self-satisfaction. The task of these young men would be to disguise themselves as non-Jews acting upon the brutal Zionist, plague and continually harass these Jews with anti-Semitic slogans such as "Bloody Jew! Death to the Jews! Jew, go to Palestine!" and similar threats. I can assure you that the results in terms of mass-immigration to Israel from these countries would be ten

**Rebirth and Destiny of Israel* David Ben-Gurion, Philosophical Library, New York, 1954, pp. 94-95.

> thousand times larger than the results henceforth achieved by thousands of our emissaries who have been preaching in vain for decades to deaf ears.

Here David Ben-Gurion reveals himself to be a man of such low moral calibre that he would sanction the artificial persecution of his own Jewish brethren by his own countrymen in order to force them against their will to leave the land of their birth where they have been rooted for generations to provide "Israel" with its cannon-fodder.

In his autobiography, *Trial and Error*, Chaim Weizman who became the first present of Israel, tells how he confessed before the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine: "Thou shalt not kill has been ingrained in us since Mount Sinai. It was inconceivable ten years ago (1938) that the Jews should break this commandant. Yet, unfortunately they are breaking it today (1948) and nobody deplores it more than the vast majority of Jews. I hang my head in shame when I must speak of this fact before you." And at the conclusion of this same book, he writes: "I am certain that in the future, the world will judge the state of Israel by its treatment of the Arabs." Yet in a discussion with James G. McDonald, the first Amercian Ambassador to Israel as quoted in his book, *My Mission to Israel*, (New York, 1951, p. 145), he referred to the Palestinian exile as a "miraculous clearing of the land; the miraculous simplification of Israel's task!"

Living in a state of constant war and permanent emergency, the most important institution in

Israel today is the army. The manner in which the Israeli army operates is strikingly reminiscent of the Indian-fighters in early American history. Some Israeli soldiers, drilled in military training since childhood and attained the rank of national heroes, have exalted the cult of violence to a positive virtue. Here is the career of one of them as related by a well-known Israeli journalist:

> Legendary and still revered by army regulars, youngsters and an important section of the popular press is the figure of Meir Har-Zion. In an army which is supplanting the Kibbutz as the most genuine Israeli institution, Har-Zion has become an Israeli hero, the living symbol of a "new" cold-blooded, fighting Jew with an armor-plated conscience. In the Israeli army, paratooper units, much like the Indian-fighting cavalry in the early history of America, perform the most arduous tasks and take the heaviest toll. Har-Zion is Israel's most famous paratrooper. He acquired his fame in the mid 1950's and continues as a hero even though severely crippled in action, he long ago returned to civilian life. General Moshe Dayan has written that "Har-Zion's fighting instinct and courage set an example for the entire Israeli Defence Forces."
>
> Meir Har-Zion was born a third generation *sabra* in 1934 in the village of Herzlia, a few miles north of Tel-Aviv. He was a moody and restless teen-ager with an obsessive urge to prove his courage and physical prowess and often ran off on dangerous adventures. Har-Zion was eighteen when he joined the army in 1953. To his physical prowess and dare-devil courage, tested and refined on his private jaunts into Arab territory as a teen-ager, was now added a brutal ruthlessness that soon stamped him for a special unit of commando fighters. At that time Company 101 served to deter Arab terrorist attacks on Israeli civilians through the staging of retaliatory acts. The

then Chief of Staff, General Moshe Dayan, explained the new doctrine of retaliatory strikes against Arab civilian targets across the border : Arab Governments would restrain their own irregulars only after it became clear that the "theft of one cow from the Jewish Settlement of Ramat Ha-Kovesh will hurt the Arab village of Kalkilya (across the nearby Jordinian border) and that the murder of one Jew at Ruhama will endanger the Palestinian refugee population in Gaza."

It was not a very far-sighted policy and not at all effective; the difference between act and retaliation blurred quickly in the recurrent strike and counter-strike. But Har-Zion seemed born to his new task. As a young commando, he took part almost nightly in difficult reprisal actions. Unsparing of himself and of others, he was brutally indiscriminate in afflicting punishment upon his adversaries. He personified an Israeli version of the Indian-fighters in the American Wild West. Laconically killing Arab peasants and towns people, he remained cold-blooded and thoroughly efficient, simply doing a job and doing it well, twice or three times a week for months. Finally he was put out of action, critically wounded in a raid on a Jordanian police station. His life was saved by an emergency battlefield tracheotomy with a penknife but he suffered permanent injury to his hands and voice. Today, half-crippled, married, with four children, he lives on a lonely farm atop a windy mountain overlooking the Jordan Valley south of the Lake of Galilee, He published his private diaries in 1969—the laconic account of his youthful exploits :

> "Halt! Rolling stones ahead of us. I notice a man roaming in the area. Now we can no longer try to withdraw quietly. He must be liquidated! I raise my pistol. My friend Jibli approaches crawling: "Har-Zion, for God's sake, use your knife!" I lower my pistol and unsheath my commando knife. We crawl towards the Arab who is now singing an Arabic song to himself. In a moment his song will be a moan of agony. We creep closer and closer. Here he is, only a few meters away! We jump. My friend,

Jibli gets hold of him, I push my knife into the striped robe covering his back. Blood spurts from the wound. Now there is no time for thinking. We stab. The Arab before us moans, fights for his life. Slowly resistance ceases......"

General Ariel Sharon, a former commander of the paratroopers contributed an enthusiastic introduction to this diary. He wrote that Meir Har-Zion was the fighting symbol not only of the paratroopers but of the entire Israel Defence Forces.

The life of Har-Zion characterizes a spreading cult of toughness in Israel. Teachers, parents, youth leaders, engage in a constant battle against the senseless emulation of military practices and needless rigors in the youth movements and schools.

The para-military youth organization—GADNA ("Regiments of Youth") has been especially prone to this kind of regimentation. GADNA operates in conjunction with the educational authorities in nearly all of the high schools in the country. Senseless tests of endurance under excruciatingly difficult conditions of climate and terrain in the name of a spartan ideal of physical fitness have led to fatal accidents among teen-agers. Almost every summer a number of children die of sunstroke in the desert where they have been made to march for days or fall down into deep precipices while walking on narrow mountain paths in exercises designed to steel their nerves and train them to unflinching courage.

This spartan rigidity often spills over from the military into the civilian sphere. Foreigners are often more aware of such characteristics than some of the most critical Israelis. In 1969 a team of young Israeli long-distance walkers participated in an international walking contest in Holland. One of the Dutch organizers asked the Israelis why everything they did was done in military rhythm, "Singing, eating, resting—everything! Why are there never dropouts on the Israeli team! Why do you function like a well-oiled but

inhuman machine. "Your teams," said the Dutchman, "remind me of the Nazi youth groups during the 1930's." The Dutchman meant no insult. He simply wanted to indicate elements of the Israeli character. When some of the members of the Israeli team suddenly felt sick and wanted to drop out, the team captain announced: "It is better to die than stop walking and be a disgrace to Israel."*

In Israel today, the extremist position has triumphed and enjoys complete domination over all aspects of its national life. But since the moral sense is a universal, innate human quality which can never be crushed completely, decent people with a sensitive conscience can be found everywhere, including Israel. This moral consciousness is increasingly evident among the intellectuals and has found its expression in serious contemporary Hebrew literature. Even among the young recruits in the army, there is growing protest against the concept of patriotism which forces them to torture and kill innocent human beings for the greater glory of the State :

Shortly after the June 1967 war a group of young kibbutzniks, headed by a former pupil of Martin Buber, went from Kibbutz to Kibbutz, asking ex-fighters a number of penetrating highly personal questions. They tape-recorded a long series of interviews with young soldiers which were then published under the title, "Fighter's Talk." None of the participants in these dialogues doubted the justice of the cause of Israel. They saw their struggle not in terms of ideology but of sheer survival. But none of them rejoiced in victory. Few could forget the scenes of suffering or overlook the price paid by both victors and vanquished.

One of the soldiers told his interviews : that in one of the battles after he had shot an Egyptian, he discovered that

*_The Israelis : Founders and Sons_, Amos Elon, Bantam Books, New York, 1971, pp. 302-309.

he had missed. "I had to shoot," he said, "but I was glad that he got away..."

Equally important was the sudden opportunity for young Israelis to face the mass of vanquished Palestinians in the occupied towns and villages of Jordan's West Bank and the dismal refugee camps of the Gaza strip. For young Israelis, this was the first opportunity of its kind. Although there has been no official change in the Israeli Government's attitude towards the Palestinian refugees, at least some of the young Israeli soldiers were struck by the sudden confrontation with so much misery. Statistics and abstract slogans suddenly took on human forms. The wretchedness was too heartbreaking, in the eyes of this sensitive minority, to be dismissed by the accepted political cliches. Many Israeli soldiers were surprised, and some were deeply disturbed to discover among the refugees a form of "Arab Zionism:" the living memory of a lost homeland to which they were as passionately attached as the Jews had remained attached to Zion in the lands of the dispersion. The education of these young soldiers, mostly born after the establishment of Israel, little prepared them for such a discovery as this. Upon entering a refugee camp, one young soldier discovered that the inmates were still organized into and dwelled as small clans or neighbourhood units according to the village, town and even the street they had lived prior to their exile in 1948—villages, towns and cities that were now thoroughly Israeli—Beersheba, Ramleh, Jaffa, etc.

The effects of the traumatic impact of the Nazi holocaust upon the national psychology of the Israelis particularly in times of war, leads to the most strenuous exertion and resistance but also to pangs of conscience in victory and a potential of compassion and empathy for the wretched loser. The moving confession of another young soldier illustrates this point. In the early days of confusion following the 1967 war, masses of civilian Arabs fled the territories suddenly occupied by Israel. This soldier, remembering the terrible exodus, testified to his sense of

personal identification. "I felt directly identified with the Palestinian refugees. When I saw those children carried in the parents' arms, I almost saw myself carried by my father during the Nazi terror of World War II. My emotional identification was entirely with the other side—with our enemies......" Still another soldier bitterly admitted that when he entered an Arab refugee camp in order to stamp out a revolt, "I felt like a Nazi, just like a member of the Gestapo. I thought of my home which was destroyed by the Nazies in Europe. I thought my parents were being led away......"*

The most important anti-Semitic book written in modern times is, of course, *Mein Kamph*—the autobiography of Adolf Hitler. In order to understand the roots of European anti-Semitism, a brief analysis of this work is essential. Hitler was quite correct when he pointed out the danger of Jewish domination in the world in general and Germany in particular. Events in Germany were sufficient proof of the validity of this warning as prior to the ascendency of the Nazi regime in 1933, Jews held the key position in every area of national life. Hitler also stated the truth when he warned the people that Jews cannot attain this domination except at the expense of non-Jews. *But Hitler's fatal error was his analysis of the Jewish menace on the basis of race rather than ideology.* Thus the reader finds expounded on page after page of *Mein Kamph* hysterical and irrational fears about the danger of the pure Nordic Ayrans being contaminated through "blood-poisoning" by intermarriage with Jews to produce a mixed breed of

*Ibid., pp. 311-314, 342-344.

inferior humans. Hitler's obcession with the racial purity of Germany was pathological in the extreme and lacks any scientific foundation for how can a people so small in numbers who can produce so many outstanding individuals in the arts and sciences be an "inferior race?" Surely a people who can boast of intellectual giants like Albert Einstein must be a "superior race" for to give the Devil his due, the Jews could not achieve supremacy without superior intelligence (though it may be diabolical intelligence), superior talents and abilities, a special cleverness for organizing themselves and hard work. But most disastrous of all were the methods Hitler advocated for the "Final Solution" of the Jewish problem. Not only were the Nazi atrocities aimed at the genocide of the Jews of Europe unsurpassed in their horror, cruelty and inhumanity but even from Hitler's point of view, they completely defeated his own purpose. Nazi atrocities only succeeded in capturing for the Jews the undeserved sympathy of Western public opinion for any person with a shred of decency could not but react with revulsion at the thought of massacres, tortures, concentration camps and gas chambers where this indiscriminate slaughter continued unabated throughout the years of World War II. The Nazis did massacre six million Jews but what was the result ? Wealthy Jews holding top positions found it easiest to bribe corrupt Nazi officialdom so they could quickly migrate unharmed to America with all their property. The Jews who suffered most from Nazi occupation were the poor in humble occupations, the comparatively innocent and innocuous folk who had no means of escape. After Hitler's suicide and the defeat of Nazi

Germany, the long-established captains of Jewish finance found no difficulty in re-establishing themselves. Consequently in Germany today, the Zionists enjoy as complete stranglehold over the mass-media as they do in America, to such an extent that any book daring to criticize the activities of the Jews has no chance of being published. After twelve years of Nazi persecution, the Jewish influence over Germany's national life emerged more powerful than ever before.

Unfortunately the Nazi type of anti-Semitism did not vanish after the defeat of Germany in World War II. Directly as a result of the rise of the powerful Zionist movement and its remarkable success in attaining its territorial ambitions at the expense of the Arabs, anti-Semitism has been exported from Europe to the Muslim world. The moral and material support Israel has received from the West, (specifically America), only intensifies this bitterness.

> Muslim-Jewish relations of course were far from ideal even before Zionism. But in the Muslim East there had never (or almost never) been a pogrom of Jews. There had not been hatred of Jews based on purely racial grounds. In this sense, the Arabs had never been "anti-Semitic." They are now beginning to be. The Arab-Israeli conflict is now producing a new species of Arab anti-Semitism never seen before. (pp. 30-31)....
>
> Arab-Muslim anti-Semitism is the result of the Arab-Israeli wars. Anti-Semitic literature in the Arab and Muslim countries abound with references to the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, *The International Jew* by Henry Ford and even Adolf Hitler's *Mein Kamph*. Yehshofat Harkaby, an Israeli scholar and a student of the Arab-Israeli conflict estimated that in 1967 of the 160 recent books in Arabic dealing with Israel, some 50 are

based either directly on the *Protocols* or quote them sympathetically. Viciously anti-Semitic tracts have been issued in recent years not only by state-owned publishing houses in Cairo and Damascus but in the relative freedom of Beirut as well. Some of them openly praise Hitler and laud the Nazi genocide of European Jewry and a few, following the example of medieval European literature, have even resurrected the ancient blood accusations about alleged human sacrifice on the Passover and slaughtering Gentile infants to suck their blood and mix it with the unleavened Passover bread. (pp. 283-284).

Even Muslim countries which are not Arab and geographically so remote that they have never been directly involved in the Palestine conflict are affected. (p. 31).*

Here in Pakistan anti-Semitism has become very strong and Pakistanis become almost as emotional over the subject as the Arabs.

Zionism must be regarded by the Muslim scholar in its proper context in the historical development of 19th-century European nationalism, imperialism and colonialism. It merely represents the last and final stage of the Western "civilizing mission" to the East and "white supremacy."

The real enemy of the Muslim is not so much the Jew as the Western materialistic way of life imposed upon us by an alien educational, political, economic and social systems and by the mass-media (radio, television and cinema). Although it cannot be denied that Jews have participated enthusiastically in this destructive activity against human civilization, religion and culture, Christians, Hindus, atheists agnostics,

**The Israelis : Founders and Sons*, Amos Elon, Bantam Books, New York, 1971.

Communists and westernized "Muslims" are all equally involved. The Jew cannot be singled out as unique.

Jews are as human as any other people, consisting of both the good and the evil mingled together in varied proportions. Of course, during war-time, it is natural to hate the enemy, but this produces only negative results and fails to accomplish anything constructive or worthwhile. One can combat the enemy far more effectively though accurate knowledge and intelligent understanding than blind, wholesale, indiscriminate hatred on racial grounds as Hitler and the Nazi regime did in Germany. Even if a Muslim Hitler could successfully carry out the massacre of every Jew on earth, this would not promote the cultural, moral and spiritual regeneration of Muslims without which an Islamic renaissance is impossible.

What a paradox it is that **Adolf Hitler proved to be the greatest benefactor of Zionism!** Indeed, it is a fact that the leading Nazi intellectuals were well-versed in Zionist literature and quoted it freely in their anti-Semitic propaganda. A close study of Zionism and Nazism reveals to the scholar some striking similarities. Both Nazism and Zionism were in complete agreement on the following points:

1. That the emancipation of the Jews in Europe was a mistake;

2. That the Jews can function in the lands of Europe only as a disruptive influence;

3. That all Jews of the world are a homogeneous race despite their diverse political allegiances;

4. That the Jews, unlike the other peoples of Europe, are unique and resist assimilation.

5 That anti-Semitism is the natural expression of the nationalist feeling of the European nations and hence ineradicable.

Not only did the Zionist literature in Germany between 1920—1930 feed the anti-Semitic Nazi propaganda with all the material it needed, but the Zionist movement itself greatly facilitated the Nazi "Final Solution" of the Jewish problem.

The chief ideologists of German Zionism were *Jacob Klatzkin* and *Nachum Goldman.* They had tasted the first fruit of Herzl's earlier effort. The *Balfour Declaration* had been issued in 1917 and German Zionists had persuaded the German Government, a recent mortal enemy of Britain to praise the British statement. German Zionists apparently felt that the day was at hand when most Jews would leave Europe for Palestine. Some Zionist writers were so confident of the building up of the homeland that they had no qualms concerning the tearing down of existing Jewish communities. The Kastner trial in Israel and the Hecht, Hilberg and Arendt books clearly documented how **Jewish Agency leaders withheld from the mass of Jews in Eastern Europe the fact that they were marked for shipment to death camps.** Both the trial and these books* clearly suggest that by maintaining the Nazi secret, the Zionist leadership inside and outside Hitler's Europe, made impossible a mass uprising of the Jews and enabled the route to the gas chambers to remain unblocked by the des-

**Perfidy*, Ben Hecht, Julian Messner, New York, 1961.

*The Destruction of the European Jews*, Raul Hilberg, Chicago, 1961.

*Eichmann in Jerusalem*, Hannah Arendt, Viking Press, New York, 1963.

perate rebellion of doomed men. In return, a few hundred Zionist leaders were permitted to escape to freedom.*

The bonds of sympathy and common understanding between the Nazis and the Zionists can best be appreciated in this significant episode as related by none else than the architect of the Jewish massacre—Eichmann—shortly before his execution in Tel-Aviv :

Dr. Rudoph Kastner, authorized representative of the Zionist movement, was an ice-cold lawyer and a fanatical Zionist. Kastner agreed to help keep the Jews in the concentration camps from resisting deportation and even keep order in the collection camps before their extermination—if I would close my eyes and allow a few hundred or a few thousand young Jews in the Zionist movement emigrate illegally to Palestine. It was a good bargain. For keeping order in the concentration camps, the price of 15,000 or 20,000—in the end there may have been more—was not too high for me. Kastner never came to me fearful of the Gestapo strong man. We negotiated entirely as equals. While we talked, he would smoke one aromatic cigarette after another, taking them from a silver case and lighting them from a silver lighter. With his great polish and reserve, I think he would have made an ideal Gestapo officer himself. Dr. Kastner's main concern was to make it possible for a select group of Hungarian Jews to emigrate to Palestine. I believe that Kastner would have sacrificed a thousand or a hundred thousand to achieve his goal. As I told Kastner, "We Nazis too are idealists and we too had to shed our own blood before we came to power."**

*"The Zionist Wish and the Nazi Deed", Benjamin Matovu, *The Islamic Review*, Working, England, May 1967, p. 5.

**Quoted from *Life Magazine*, November 28 and December 5, 1960.

In order to achieve their political objectives, the Zionist leaders have been so ruthless that they did not hesitate even to murder their own people. One of the worst Zionist crimes against innocent Jews occurred in 1940 in the sinking of the Patria, a refugee cargo ship carrying Jews from Nazi-occupied Europe to Palestine. Not until a decade after the tragic event did it became publically known that it was the Zionists themselves who had ordered the destruction of the ship with its 1,800 passengers within sight of land and was responsible for the drowning of more than 250 persons in order to arouse artificial anti-British sentiment. At the time of the incident, these deaths were attributed to the British and it was only in 1950 when it was discovered that the *Haganah* General Staff had been responsible for the disaster. Here is how David Finker, Israeli correspondent for the Yiddish-language *Morning Journal* of New York described what actually happened:

> It was then that the *Haganah* General Staff took a decision at which their leaders shuddered. The decision was not to permit PATRIA to leave the port of Jaffa. The English must be given to understand that Jews could not be driven away from their rightful homeland. The PATRIA must be blown up. The decision was conveyed to *Haganah* members on the PATRIA and in the hush of night, preparations had begun for the execution of the tragic act. On Sunday, November 26, 1940, the passengers were informed by the English that they were being returned to sea. The Jews remained silent save for a whisper from man to man to "go up to the deck—all up on deck!" Apparently the signal did not reach everybody for many hundreds remained below —never to see light again. Suddenly an explosion was heard, and a panic ensued. It was a hellish scene ; people jumped

> into the water, children were tossed into the waves; agonizing cries pierced the night. The number of victims was officially placed at 276. The survivors were permitted by the British High Commander to land.*

Originally the overwhelming majority of these displaced people wanted new homes for themselves and what remained of their families in the U.S.A., Great Britain, Canada, Australia, New Zealand or Argentina but to their utter dismay, these countries with their rigid immigration quotas, barred at all but an insignificant few. What a paradox it is that the very nations which most vehemently opposed Jewish immigration to their own shores, were the most zealous supporters of unlimited Jewish immigration to Palestine ! The Zionist propaganda capitalized to the limit on the Nazi atrocities which it had been so much responsible for and with consummate skill, played on the emotions of the public in Europe and America.

> The Zionist movement knew that Palestine would for many years to come, be a remittance society. They knew they could raise vast sums for the Zionist organization only by telling its donors that there is no other place these poor Jews could go. In other words, to permit the victims to go to America, England, Australia, South Africa and other countries would undermine the political necessity for a national Jewish "homeland."**

This dishonesty outraged the moral sense of some of America's most respected Jews. Dr.

**The Other Side of the Coin*, Alfred Lillienthall, New York, 1965, as quoted in *The Criterion* : Bi-monthly of the Islamic Research Academy, Karachi, July-August 1968, p. 81.

***The Decadence of Judaism in our Times*, Moshe Menuhin, op. cit., p. 96.

Louis Finkelstein, America's foremost Talmudic scholar and rector of the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York stated in a press conference in 1951 that it had always been his feeling "if the American Jews had exerted as much effort into getting the displaced persons admitted to this country as they had given to Zionism, a good home could certainly have been found in the New World for all the Jewish refugees in Europe." And the Jewish publisher of *The New York Times.* Hays Sulzberger declared in disgust: "Why should the fate of all those unhappy people be subordinated to the slogan of Jewish Statehood?"* Simultaneously, a vilification campaign was waged relentlessly on the press, radio, televison and films against the Arabs inside and outside Palestine to arouse violent hatred against them so that the monstrous injustice inherent in Zionist ambitions would appear to the public as justified. This Zionist propaganda won enormous success, so much so that it not only dominated all the mass-media in America so the Arab-Muslim view-point could not even receive a hearing, but American politics, both domestic and foreign, subordinated all other considerations to the welfare of Zionism. Moral and material support for the state of "Israel" is a fundamental plank of the platforms of both major political parties in America—the Republicans and the Democrats. During every presidential campaign in America the rival candidates spare no efforts to outdo each other in praise of Zionism before Zionist organizations which are all widely

***Ibid.*

publicized over press, radio and television. No public figure would dare criticize "Israel" lest a campaign of slander be waged against him and his whole career ruined. In order to pander to the American Jewish vote in the forthcoming presidential elections, Franklin Delano Roosevelt hold on board his private yacht in the Bitter Lakes of the Suez Canal in 1942 a special conference with King Ibn Saud, offered to bribe him with a large sum if he would only permit Jews free settlement in al-Madina, as they had prospered there at the time of the Holy Prophet. Furiously angry, the King responded with a contemptuous "No!" His wife, the late Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt was such a staunch Zionist that even the Jews could not match her zeal. She was the heart and soul of every Zionist fund-raising campaign from whence millions of American dollars flowed into "Israel." The late Adlai Stevenson was second to none to Mrs. Roosevelt among Christian supporters of Zionism, so much so that his plea over television for America to join "Israel," England and France in the their invasion of Egypt in November 1956, to capture the Suez Canal, was the major issue in the Presidential campaign of that year. President Eienshower had the rare moral courage steadfastly to oppose what he knew was against both justice and the true interest of his country and, although harshly criticized by the Zionist-dominated mass-media, he finally won out. In regard to this Zionist influence in America, I speak from my own experience. I was not quite fourteen years old when the state of "Israel" was proclaimed in May 1948. I remember so vividly seeing the multitude of "Israeli" blue and white flags with

star of David flying in New York long before they were hoisted in Palestine. I will never forget the passionate speeches and equally passionate songs and the fund-raising drives that were so much a part of my adolescence. Even one like myself who always enraged my family and friends because of my sympathy for the Arabs, was so convinced by the propaganda that when I was eighteen years old, I joined the local chapter of the *Mizrachi Hatzair*, a religious Zionist youth organization. I was only an immature and unsophisticated girl who had been deceived by the illusion that Zionism was a very idealistic noble-minded movement. I thought the Jews were returning to Palestine to strengthen their close ties of kinship and culture with their Semitic cousins and that together the Jews and Arabs would cooperate and achieve another Golden Age of culture in the Western Asia! Within a few months, I discovered the truth and left the organization thoroughly disillusioned.

Why is the overwhelming majority of Christian Americans and Europeans so emotionally committed Zionism? Paradoxically, although the Jews were the victims of persecution in Europe for more than a thousand years, climaxed by the Nazi holocaust, Western support for Zionism has strong racial overtones. Zionist propaganda never fails to represent the Jews as white Europeans, the ambassadors of the "progress" and prosperity of Western civilization while the Arabs are condemned as subhuman Asiatics. Writes the late Bartley C. Crum, a Roman Catholic, chosen by President Truman to be a member of the

Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine in December 1945 :

Cairo was a revelation—and a long step forward in my education. Here for the first time I saw the Middle East stripped of the travel writer's star dust. I began to feel its tempo, to begin in limited measure, to understand the world of Islam. Here in this hot, sun-baked city, I saw the Arab in his native habitat and native dress—incredible numbers wearing their long, single-piece nightgown—like robes, representing a degree of poverty and a level of subsistence I had seen nowhere in the Western world, I saw Arabs sprawled sleeping in doorways and in the shadow of buildings, Arab women crouched with their young, munching bread undisturbed while flies clustered in seething masses on the abscessed eyes of their infants and I was sickened. (pp. 146-147). In this gateway to the Middle East, I realized that I had plunged back through the centuries to an almost unbelievable way of life. The doctrine of human rights and personal liberty—the concept that man had dignity as a human being and the latent power to lift himself from the mire of animal existence—had not penetrated the citadels of Islamic authoritarianism. As the roll call of witnesses continued, it was evident that their antipathy was not towards Judaism but towards Westernism; that was the encroachment they fought. Was this not perhaps the basic tragedy of the Middle East? Westernism meant higher standards of living; it meant reduction in infant mortality, in disease, in poverty; it meant opening the door to some measure of freedom and happiness to the forgotten men and women of this area of the world. It was this, precisely, to which our witnesses objected. At no time did the witnesses in Cairo speak in terms of the masses and their improvement. One felt their ever-present sense of fatalism. A child born crippled limps through life; a child blind from trachoma is a victim of Allah's will, not man's. And who was to say that Allah chose wrongly in singling out this child? (pp. 152-153).

During the train's interminable pauses in Egypt, I had had my fill of its desert scenes—the mud hovels, the faceless children, for so they appeared, wrapped up in the same nondescript robes as their parents; the slow, painful, miserable existence. But once in Palestine, the tempo and colour of life changed sharply. Things seemed to quicken, to become more alive; children were suddenly no longer tiny bundles of rags but youngsters wearing shorts with sturdy arms and legs and open smiling faces and bright eyes—alert and human again (p. 159. As we drove through the country, I became aware of a remarkable physical phenomenon. Many of the Jewish children I saw were blonde and blue-eyed, a mass mutation that I was told, is yet to be adequately explained. One might almost assert that a new Jewish folk is being created in Palestine; the vast majority almost a head taller than their parents, a sturdy people, more a throwback to the farmers and fishermen of Jesus' day than products of the sons and daughters of eastern and central Europe. (p. 192).

My gateway to Tel-Aviv was through Jaffa. An American soldier had told me of his pleasure at seeing the shadow of a tree outlined on a white side-walk and realized that this tableau meant civilization. Jaffa, in contrast, reminded me of Cairo. Vegetables and decayed fruit lay in the streets, whitewash scaled off the fronts of shops and buildings and the whole city had the atmosphere of an overgrown Arab village. Driving into Tel-Aviv, you saw the houses become more habitable, the streets grow wider and treelined; the green of grass and trees planted to beautify begin to replace the ever-present gray of mud and silt and you realized that the Jews had done this because they wanted wide streets; they wanted trees and green places for the children to play in. The Arabs had blighted the earth for centuries and now the Jews were the first people to remove that blight. In Tel-Aviv, they had built a thriving city of nearly 200,000—a thoroughly civilized community with tree-shaded boulevards, with opera and theatres and art galleries, with play grounds and modern

schools, with buses and apartment houses. I had no idea that in Tel-Aviv you could stand on a street corner and say : This might be any modern American town." But you could! And I thought to myself; "Here before my eyes is proof that Palestine Jewry is bringing civilization to the Middle East*

As the self-appointed bearers of "progress" to a benighted Arab world, the Israeli Jew feels he has the unchallenged right to inflict upon the poor and backward the worst that can happen to them. In commenting on this attitude, Ben Shlome writing in *Ner*, observes :

South African Europeans have been speaking thus about the poverty of the slums where the black Africans live and South Americans comment about the poverty of the native Indians and this is precisely how we Jews were described in the Diaspora when foreign journalists saw the miserable dwellings of the "dirty Jews" in our little towns in Eastern Europe with the filth and starving children in the streets. And this is how we ourselves talk when we go through the slums inhabited by our own brethren, the Oriental Jews. It is nothing more than the attitude of the upper classes, sated and smug—the white man looking down with contempt upon the miserable and the oppressed. Such a man does not think of asking why.

In the Diaspora we used to find a thousand explanations for our miserable condition; we blamed non-Jewish society, Government and its officials, the policy of prejudice and discrimination against us, the wickedness of the non-Jewish rulers, the ghetto into which we were incarcerated and all the obstacles in the way of our economic and cultural development. How we knew how to shout, how to arouse pity about our wretched fate!

***Behind the Silken Curtain*, Bartley C. Crum, Simon & Schuster, New York, 1947, pp. 195-196.

> And here we are, in the country that we have established, the state we have built, with nobody to stop us from organizing our life in it along all the principles of social and human justice which we have demanded for ourselves. Have we stood the test? **Are we not following in the very same footsteps of these who oppressed and humiliated us?** And what is worse, is it not terrible that our senses have become so dulled that we no longer feel guilt about the evil that is being done to others whether they be Jews or not? How can such observers describe the wretched conditions under which these Arabs live without accusing, without asking whence it comes and who is responsible?*

According to Westerners imbued with this variety of pure and naked materialism, poverty and backwardness are not misfortunes which entitle those afflicted with sympathetic assistance but rather constitute such unpardonable crimes that if the Arabs are condemned by the Zionists as guilty, they deserve no human rights at all! The late Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, one of the most zealous of all Christian Zionists, justified the expulsion of the Arabs from Palestine on this curious pretext:

> Prejudice and feeling must be put aside and **the whole refugee problem looked upon as an economic one.** Israel must realize the benefit to her of establishing peaceful relations. She needs the resources of the Arab countries; she needs Arab oil, food and raw materials. Obviously the Arabs would gain immeasurably if such friendly arrangements were possible. The industry and energy of the Jews of Israel, the skills, the organizing ability and technical knowledge they brought with them from other countries if applied to the problems of the Arab economy, could do much to raise the standard of living in

*Quoted from *The Other Side of the Coin*, Alfred Lillienthal, Devln Adair Publishing Co., New York, 1965, pp. 218-219.

> every country of the area. Instead, the Arabs talk hopefully of wiping out the people of Israel. Even if this were possible, such a war would be a grievous thing. Although the Arabs would gain some land and the refugees could return to what homes they had left, they would not put into the country the hard and intelligent work that the Jews have. And unless they did, all development would stop; the land would deteriorate, barren plains and dry deserts would appear where tree-planted fields and productive farms now flourish. The loss would be not only to the people of Israel but to the future development of the entire Middle East.*

Zionist propaganda spares no efforts to degrade the Arabs in the eyes of Americans and Europeans as an innately inferior people. Zionist leadership believes as implicitly as did Hitler that you need only repeat a lie long enough before people will begin to believe it. Exactly like the racist propaganda of the Nazis, the Zionists feel certain that if their rivals can be convincingly portrayed as sub-humans—a variety of vermin like rats and lice, that will be sufficient psychological pretest to justify their being treated like rats and lice. These consider ations dictate the tactics of the anti-Arab propaganda with which the Zionists have bombarded Europe and America for more than a half century.

Let us proceed to examine this hate literature in detail. We will now quote a passage from Leon Uris' best selling Zionist novel, *Exodus* (Bantam Books, New York, 1958) which sold millions of copies in America

**India and the Awakening East*, Eleanor Roosevelt, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1953, pp. 33-34.

and abroad :

> The next morning Ari and Kitty left Jerusalem and continued northward into the Galilee. They drove through the timeless Arab villages into the fertile carpet of the Jezreel valley which the Jews had turned from swamp into the finest farmland in the Middle East. As the road wound out of the Jezreel towards Nazareth, they moved backward in time. On one side of the hill, the lush lands of the Jewish *kibbutzim* and on the other, the sun-baked, dried-out, barren fields of the Arabs. Nazareth was much as Jesus must have found it in this youth.
>
> Ari parked his car in the centre of town. He brushed off a group of Arab urchins but one child persisted ;
>
> "Guide?"
>
> "No!"
>
> "Souvenirs? I got wood from the Cross, cloth from the Robe."
>
> "Get out of here!"
>
> "Dirty pictures?"
>
> Ari tried to pass the boy but he clung on and grabbed Ari by the pants leg. *Maybe you like my sister? She is a virgin.*"
>
> Ari flipped the boy a coin before he and Kitty ran,
>
> Nazareth stank. The streets were littered with dung and blind beggars made wretched noises and barefoot, ragged, filthy children were underfoot. Flies were everywhere. Kitty was baffled as they drove from Nazareth. It was a dreadful place. "At least the Arabs there are friendly," Ari said. "They are Christians." "They are Christians who need a bath, replied Kitty. (p. 334).

What an excellent illustration who this diabolic mentality works! Anybody who has the slightest familiarity with the traditional customs of the Arabs, knows how highly they regard a woman's chastity, that the brother feels himself responsible for his

sister's honour so much so that he feels it is his right to take her life to preserve the family's reputation if there is the slightest suspicion of immorality.

Here is another choice specimen of Zionist hate-propaganda. The author is not himself a Jew but a fanatically pro-Zionist Armenian Christian who with vivid childhood memories of the Turkish persecution, at the time of the first world war, extends his hatred for Turks to include Arabs and all other Muslim peoples. The incident takes place in Jerusalem during the 1948 Palestine war :

> In charge of our arsenal was one of the most bloodthirsty Arabs I ever met. He was a thin, morbid fanatic with blazing black eyes named Ali. I won his friendship by photographing him repeatedly in the act of firing a *Bren gun*. Sitting on a box of bullets or grenades, I would gaze at Ali with the conviction that I was facing a dormant savage, a ruthless killer whose violent passions were suppressed. One day I started to converse with him telling a bare-faced lie:
>
> "Ali, I have studied medicine, psychology and the science of the human mind. I can tell many things about a person by looking at him. You are a very strong and brave Arab but you are afraid to do what your heart dictates. Tell me what it is and perhaps we can do it together."
>
> Ali looked at me intently with a savage glint in his eyes which made me uncomfortable. We were alone; he was armed and I knew I was no match for a man whom I felt instinctively was a killer.
>
> "I want revenge! I must clear myself of all my sins before Allah. I must kill Jews—many Jews! I must kill till my arm is tired. I must not stop killing Jews until their bodies are piled this high" The wild Arab brought one hand to his chin. "I must do one more thing. For this I need your help."

"Your wish is my command, Ali."

"I want you to come with me the next time we fight. When I catch a Jew alive, I want you to be with me with your camera."

"Why do you want me with my camera ?" I asked innocently;"

"I want you to take one picture of me holding the living Jew by the throat. I want you to take another picture while I stab the Jew in the neck. Then I want pictures as I stab him again and again, in the face, in the heart, in his belly—with this knife!" Ali whipped out a vicious blade. "After I have killed the Jew, I want you to photograph me drinking his blood."

"While it is still warm, I suppose."

"Yes, while it is running warm from his body!" Ali affirmed*.

Though Zionism has enjoyed a tremendous success in America in terms of propaganda, politics and finances, in one crucial aspect, it has been a complete failure. Ever since the main source of immigration to "Israel" in Europe as a result of World War II has been exhausted, Zionist zealots have been pleading in vain for American Jews to go and settle in Israel. "Family-planning" has no place in the policy of the "Israeli" government. The military leaders of this Zionist state consider a maximum population of Jews essential for its security, but since the birth-rate of the Jews of European origin living there is rather low, there is a great demand for more and more immigrants. "Israel's" population policy is to encourage the land to become so crowded with Jews, that any return of

*Cairo to Damascus*, John Roy Carlson, Alfred A. Knoph, New York, 1952, pp. 225-227.

the Arab refugees would be impossible! Immigrants are particularly wanted to settle in newly-built strategic settlements on formerly Arab land in order to make the Jewish colonization permanent. American Jews, always so generous with their money for Zionism, nevertheless have no desire to exchange their comfortable homes in New York for the hardships of living in one of the primitive, pioneer settlements in the desert wastes on "Israel's" perilous frontiers !

An American Jewish anthropologist, who is a professor at the University of California, although thoroughly sympathetic to Zionism, confirms the prevelance of atheism and materialism in his study of child-rearing on an "Israeli" collective farm. The *Kibbutz* under study was run by the Communist Party. Pictures of Lenin and Stalin hang in the children's dormitories and in their classrooms. *Pravda* is daily read by all those in the settlement who know Russian as are other Communist literature. The study of Marxist-Leninst philosophy and Jewish history interpreted by dialectial materialism is as a compulsory part of the school curriculum in the *kibbutz* as any collective farm in the Soviet Union or communist China !

> To sum up, the *sabras* native-born Israeli Jews) support —and probably will continue to support—both the Communist Party and its policies. But this support will be increasingly motivated by loyalty, training or an impersonal sense of justice—not from that personal emotional involvement that transforms political activity into personal dedication and that transmutes political belief into a world-view. But if the *sabras* are not emotionally committed to a Marxist world-view, neither have they turned to a religious one.

**The kibbutz has been eminently successful in transmitting its anti-clericalism and philosophical naturalism to its children.** In the primary school children receive an explicitly naturalistic worldview. The curriculum and its philosophy derive from a scientific view of man and the world and are explicitly opposed to supernaturalism in any form. The opposition to religion is based not only on intellectual conviction but on the belief, as an educational authority states, "that a generation educated without God will have its faith in man strengthened." Since the Bible, however, is a basic literary and historical text-book in the school system, it is necessary that the term "God" be explained as soon as it is encountered. The teachers explain that belief in supernatural beings arose among early peoples before they had acquired scientific explanations for natural phenomena and that even today, some people who have not received a scientific education continue to use this belief for the explanation of matters which they do not understand. One of the first questions which the sixth-grade class would ask of strangers was whether or not they believed in God. If the answer were in the affirmative, the latter would be teased for their "superstitious" belief. Again, on the traditional religious New Year (*Rosh Hashana*) some of the refugee children who live in the *kibbutz*, attended religious sevices—as they do on other holidays—which are conducted by the orthodox parents. As they entered the synagogue, two of the second grade children stood at the door shouting, "But there is no God ! We don't believe in God here !"

The *sabras* accept one crucial plank in the Zionist platform—the Jewish State. Other planks, however, such as the importance of Jewish culture. the unity of the Jewish people and the "ingathering of the exiles" do not evoke unanimous agreement. Indeed, there is abundant evidence to **suggest that the *sabras*** do not share these Zionist values **because they view Judaism and** Jewish-

**ness as inferior and would like to dissociate themselves from them.** Almost any form of Jewish literature is viewed by the *sabras* as "boring" so they make no attempt to read it. Since the non-historica portions of the Bible are interpreted by them as a series of fairy tales, they can see no value in them. Only when a Biblical lesson contains material of archaeological or historical interest or when a place name or historical site is personally known to them or when the lesson is related to some political or scientific interest of theirs, do the high school students reveal any interest in the Bible. But it is not only Biblical literature that is "boring." Much of tne modern Jewish literature is characterized by the same term. And only under protest do they read Mendele or Scholem Aleichem, both of whose works are included in the *Mosad* curriculum. Since, however, they are fascinated by accounts of Chinese and Indian village life, the twelfth-grade teacher asked his students to approach Scholem Aleichem's stories of the *shtetl* with the same attitude which they would approach the descriptions of the former villages. This they could not do. The latter, they argued, "holds no interest for us." Jewish music is responded to in a similar fashion. Despite the efforts of the music teacher to stimulate their appreciation, the students "hate" the Jewish music of the Diaspora (exile). He once taught his tenth-grade class a Jewish song which, however, he labelled as Russian. They thought it was marvellous, and when he revealed to them that it was a Jewish song, they refused to believe him! Jewish history fares no better. The eleventh-grade class, in desperation, asked their teacher why they could not skip over most of Jewish history and begin, rather, with the history of modern Israel. Although general European history is one of their favourite subjects, Jewish history is "boring." Writing on "What is a Jew ?" only one of the ten essayists (all seventh-grade students) mentioned any positive contributions to civilization. All the other students stressed two characteristics : the Jews

have always been persecuted, and everywhere they are despised. But modern Israelis (excluding the Yemenites and Jewish immigrants from other Arabic-speaking countries) are not at all like the "Jews" who were most often identified by such characteristics as beards and skull caps. On the contrary, writes one of the essayists: "......You will hear singing—songs of farmers, songs of rebuilding.... That is the song of the future and the rebirth of the Jewish nation...." Religious Jews—or more accurately, Orthodox Jews whose Jewish "visibility" is pronounced—are the objects of similar attitudes. A fourth-grade girl, after asking her father if he had prayed, proceeded to describe with much laughter "how the Jews in Europe had prayed." Her description, accompanied by grotesque gestures, was in the tradition of anti-Semitic caricature. And from the other end of the age scale, came this comment from an adult *sabra*: **"I hate orthodox Jews and whenever I see them, I can understand why people become anti-Semitic."** By the same token, the *sabras* both hate and fear the Oriental immigration of Jews from Arab countries. They fear these immigrants, perhaps because that *ghetto* culture of which they are so ashamed and which they believe to have been destroyed, is in danger of being revived by them. They hate them perhaps because the constant sight of these living representatives of the hated *ghetto* culture and mentality is a threat to their own self-image. Moreover the *sabras* fear that the presence in Israel of these Oriental Jews may result in their (the *sabras'*) being identified by others with them. This hatred and fear become even more understandable in view of the fact that the realization that the Oriental and Orthodox are Jews like themselves frequently comes as a shock to the *sabras*. This is illustrated by the following story recounted by a *kibbutz* father. Some years before our arrival in the *kibbutz*, he took his six-year-old daughter to Safed, the center of Orthodoxy, where for the first time she encountered bearded, orthodox Jews. She asked her father who these

strange people were and when he told her they were Jews, she became terribly confused. For her and her peers to be forced to accept the fact that the bearded men of Safed and the Oriental immigrants from Arab lands are Jews must be a painful experience. Many *sabras*, ideologically in favour of immigration, are hostile to the immigrants from the Arab Middle East whom they view as inferiors—they call them *shchorim*—"black ones." They are the constant butts of verbal aggression, taunting and teasing. The immigrant children feel like pariahs as a result of this treatment. Describing their year's experience in an article in the *kibbutz* student annual, one of them wrote: "We do not feel part of the *Mosad*. The other children laugh at us and do not accept us as friends and comrades. We feel lonely and lost." (pp. 319-310). It should, therefore, come as no surprise that the *sabras*—like some of their parents—are proud of the fact that many *kibbutz* children do not look "Jewish." Holding a blond baby for me to photograph, one *sabra* proudly remarked, "In America, they will never guess that these children are Jews—they will think they are *goyim*." (p. 388). Precisely what is the Zionist vision that is supposed to evoke the *sabras*' loyalty? **It is our thesis that the vision that the sabras have been taught to seek is incapable of providing an ideological basis for the willingness to make personal sacrifice.*** The Zionist theory that the *sabras* have learned is not based on the notion—promulgated by Achad Ha'am, Martin Buber and others—that the perpetuation of historic Jewish values and ideals is a sacred task and that the *raison d'etre* of Zionism is the establishment of a spiritual homeland where a uniquely Jewish culture might flourish. On the contrary, the important Israeli values are, according to the Zionism of the *kibbutz*, universal. **A teacher, one of the kibbutz intellectuals, reacted with great hostility when I**

*Muslims determined to wage *Jihad* against Zionism must exploit this psychological weakness of our enemy to the full!

> **asked him if he believed Jewish culture to be unique. Jewish culture, he insisted, is part of modern Western culture, and in the future, there will be but one world culture.** The goal of the Zionist enterprise in Israel was the creation of a new and healthy culture out of an old, sick culture **and the fewer connections with the old, the healthier it would be.** Hence the paradox in Zionism: "Come to Israel to build a Jewish state," entails, "Come to Israel to escape the Jewish past!" In effect, the *sabras* feel no tie, other than a negative one, with much of Jewish tradition or with distinctive Jewish values; they want little to do with the last 2,000 years of the Jewish past and they wish to dissociate themselves from those Jews who actually or symbolically represent those values and that past. Hence these aspects of Zionist ideology which stress the unity of the Jewish people, the glory of Jewish culture and the importance of Jewish values, they reject out of hand. To them, Zionism means Israeli patriotism.*

If this is the attitude of the *sabra* towards his orthodox brethren, the treatment of the Arabs can well be imagined!

What is the viewpoint of the modern Jew towards "Israel's" place in the Arab-Muslim world and the relationship between Zionism and the culture of the West? Let one of the most articulate of Zionists, formerly the chief representative of "Israel" to the United Nations and now "Israeli" Foreign Minister, speak for himself:

> It has become fashionable to assert that Israel's aspiration is for integration into the Middle East; that if it is not now a Middle Eastern state by every political and economic connection, then that lack of Middle Eastern

**Children of the Kibbutz*, Melford E. Spiro, Schocken Books, New York, 1960, pp. 388-391.

citizenship derives not from its free-will but from the imposition of the neighbouring world and that sooner or later, it is its duty to become a part of the Middle East, flesh of its flesh and bone of its bone; to become organically embodied in the political, economic and cultural life of our region. **Yet I suggest that if Israel is now separated from the Arab Middle East, we owe that separation not only to the hostility of our neighbours but also to the nature of our own national movement.** In the sphere of culture, while paying all honor to the potentiality of the Arab tradition, we come to Israel with the purpose of reviving and maintaining the Hebrew tradition. Moreover, Israel possesses unique interests, the paramount one of which is the network of connections with the Jewish world in the countries of the Dispersion. This is something exclusive to the state of Israel; something which is entirely alien to the rest of the Near East. **We should not, therefore, look upon the separateness of Israel as a transient phenomenon imposed by Arab boycott. It is imposed by desire and the aspiration of Israel itself.** The idea should not be one of integration; **Integration is rather something to be avoided.** One of the great apprehensions which afflict us when we contemplate our cultural scene is the danger lest the predominance of immigrants of Oriental origin force Israel to equalize its cultural level with that of the neighbouring world. **Far from regarding our immigrants from oriental countries as a bridge toward our integration with the Arabic-speaking world, our object should be to infuse them with the occidental spirit rather than to allow them to draw us into an unnatural orientalism.*** The recent controversy on the place of Turkey in global defence is relevant to this point. It is interesting to record the vehemence with

*This means that the Arabic-speaking Jews in "Israel" are officially regarded as a liability and not an asset. The loyalty of such a despised group to "Israel" must necessarily be weak. This fact must be fully exploited by those determined to wage *Jihad* in occupied Palestine.

which Turkey demanded to be severed from its geographical background and to live, not in the family of Arabic-speaking states of Saudi Arabia, of Syria, Lebanon or Egypt, but to be regarded as the Eastern extremity of the Western world and to live in the same strategic, political and cultural universe as Greece, Italy and France. If Turkey by reason of the Occidental emphasis of its government is able to express that feeling, I consider that Israel has a much greater right. Israel has no part of that Muslim inheritance which would have argued in favor of Turkey being regarded as a Middle Eastern state. If we Jews have suffered the whips and scorpions of exile, let us at least compensate ourselves with the retention of those Western concepts we have acquired. Ancient Hebrew civilization, with all its depth and grandeur, was limited in its scope. Hebrew Israel did not flourish in the plastic arts or in the applied sciences; its genius was exercised in a supreme but constricted avenue of cultural experience. Our Hebrew and Jewish roots are not enough and Israel has every right to enrich both its Hebrew and Jewish traditions by the products of modern Western civilization. In our concern with recapturing Hebrew and Jewish roots, we must avoid the pitfalls of provincialism.*

The proceeding quotation from one of Zionism's chief representatives is sufficient to disprove any possibility of cultural affinity between Israel and the surrounding Arab Muslim world.

From its very inception, Zionism was and still is synonymous with the imperialism of Western civilization—both political and cultural. Writes one of the earliest champions of Zionism, Vladimir Jabotinsky :

The first World War was in its fifth month and for more than three months I had been wandering over the cheerless

*The Voice of Israel*, Abba Eban, Horizon Press, New York, 1957, pp. 74-81.

world as correspondent of *Russkiya Vyedomosti* (Russian Monitor). My mission was to report on the moods and sentiments produced by the war rather than on the war itself. By the time I reached France, "Paris" had already been transferred to Bordeaux as the government offices had been forced temporarily to move out of the threatened capital. I went to Bordeaux—and there one wet morning, I read in a poster pasted on a wall that Turkey had joined the Central Powers and begun military operations. I must confess until that morning, in Bordeaux as everywhere else, my desire was stalemate and peace as soon as possible. Turkey's move transformed me in one short morning into a fanatical believer in war until victory. Turkey's move made this war "my war". In 1909 I had been chief editor of Constantionple's four Zionist newspapers at the same time (the sort of thing that only occurs in one's youth); the Young Turks then ruled the Sublime Porte and there and then I reached the steadfast conviction that where the Turk rules neither sun may shine nor grass may grow and that *the only hope for the Jewish restoration of Palestine lay in the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire.* As I saw it, the matter was crystal clear : the fate of the Jews in Russia, Poland, Galicia, very important undoubtedly, was, if viewed in the historical perspective, only something temporary as compared to the revolution in Jewish national life which the dismemberment of Turkey would bring us.

I never doubted that once Turkey entered the war, she would be defeated and sliced to pieces; here again I am at a loss to understand how anyone could ever have had any doubts on this subject. It was no guesswork but a matter of cold, statistical calculation. That Germany would be beaten into unconditional surrender, of course not even a journalist could have foreseen at that time. But that Turkey, more than anyone else would have to pay for this war, I did not and could not doubt for one moment.

Exactly at what moment I conceived the idea of Jewish fighting force—whether there in Bordeaux in front of that poster or later—I don't remember now. But. I believe that it was always clear to me that if ever a war should occur between England and Turkey, the right thing for the Jews would be to form a regiment of their own and participate in the conquest of Palestine.

I asked Max Nordau; "If the English could be persuaded to form a Jewish army to fight on the Eastern front—in Palestine—what would be your attitude?"

He was skeptical. A sound idea, but where could such a unit get soldiers? English, French, Russian Jews were serving in their respective armies; in the neutral countries in Europe, there were few Jews; Amercia was far away and besides, Jews nourished some foolish sentimental predilection for the Turk, "our cousin, Ishmael." True, no scholar on earth could tell what relation the Turks, a Turanian tribe could possibly be to Ishmael, The semite, but there it was and Nordeau himself had to face that music after his famous rebuke to the Young Turks at the Hamburg Congress.

"I remember that speech of yours," said I "but Doctor, we cannot let idiots dictate our policy! Not only are the Turks no cousins of ours, even with the real Ishmael, the Arabs, we have nothing in common. We Jews belong to Europe, thank God, for two thousand years we helped to build European civilization. And here comes one more quotation from another of your speeches. **"We Zionists are going to Palestine to extend the moral boundaries of Europe as far as the Euphrates!"** Our worst enemy in this undertaking is the Turk. Now that the hour of his downfall has struck, we cannot possibly stand by and do nothing, can we?" (pp. 29-32).

Zionism, even more than British imperialism, stood from the beginning for the total westernization of the area : Vladimir Jabotinsky continues :

Lawrence and Philby's dream was "Greater Arabia." England had administered countries where Arabic is spoken like Egypt and the Sudan for over forty years. There is a mountain of accumulated experience for dealing with such peoples. They would be "liberated," they would be united and they would be called "Greater Arabia,? They would even be given Arab kings, picturesque sheikhs in green turbans, dear, grown up children who sit on divans with their legs crossed under them and who require English advisers in all matters of state. Such a dream—rather! The English bureaucracy in Egypt before World War I consisted almost entirely of such Arabophiles. Lawrence and Philby were thus only representatives of their class—which counted its scores, all of them born members of the ruling "caste". What I wish to emphasize is the essential element of their common dream : the "greater Arabia" must unconditionally remain picturesque : camels, caravans, white burnouses, green turbans, veiled woman, harems—the full decoration of the Orient must be religiously retained. They shudder at the thougt that this beauty may be disturbed by an overdose of Western civilization.

The Balfour Declaration stabbed these Lawrences and Philby's to the heart. They had seen enough Zionist Jews to realize that the idea of Jewish national homeland in Palestine had nothing to do with "picturesque" orthodox Jews with beards and earlocks (which they could certainly have "swallowed" for they are not Jew-haters) but with modern secular Jews wearing trousers on their legs, and hats on heads with modern Western ideas under those hats! And end to all local colour! Tramcars in Jerusalem! Instead of camels and date palm trees, red roofs of brand-new Jewish settlements where girls and young men would walk freely together just as in England. Horrors!"

This is not a joke. It is the absolute truth. Lawrence published an article in a London newspaper at the time of

the Balfour Declaration in which despite himself, one could hear the echo of gnashing teeth. He was for Zionsim, he wrote, but only on one condition : that the Jews must not go to Palestine as Europeans and Amercans. They must suit themselves to the Arab customs of living— "Orientalize" themselves. Otherwise, he insisted, they would ruin both themselves and the country.

None of this is anti-Semitism. But the consequences of these reactionary influences was an unprecedented epidemic of anti-Semitism.*

What is the mentality of a master architect of Zionism on this question? As far back as the summer of 1937, Dr. Chaim Weizmann wrote to Sir John Shuckburgh, Permanent Under-Secretary for the British colonies as follows:

Nearly six months have elapsed since the Report of the Royal Commission and the White Paper restricting Jewish immigration were published. There is utter confusion as to the political intentions of His Majesty's Government. The atmosphere of doubt and suspense provides an ideal soil for every schemer and intriguer, self-appointed or foreign-paid to try his hand at advertising "solutions" to the question of Palestine. All these schemes have one and the same object : the liquidation of the National Home for Jews and the virtual handlng over of the country to the so-called Arab leaders who organized the disturbances of last year (1936) and from their hiding places are now running the terrorist campaign. The terms are always the same : liquidation of the Mandate and Jewish acceptance of minority status, the Jewish position to be protected by that invaluable instrument of "minority rights" of which we have had such instructive experience in Eastern Europe. Let there be no mistake about the

*_The Story of the Jewish Legion_. Vladimir Jabotinsky, translated by Samuel Katz, Bernard Ackerman Inc., New York, 1945, pp. 170-171.

action of the representative bodies of the Jewish people to any of these schemes. Jews are not going to Palestine to become in their ancient home, "Arabs of the Mosaic faith" or to exchange their German or Polish ghetto for an Arab one. Whoever knows what an Arab Government looks like, what "minority status" signifies nowadays and what a Jewish ghetto in an Arab state means—there are quite a number of precedents—will be able to form his own conclusions as to what would be in store for us Jews if we accepted the position allotted to us in these "solutions." It is not for the purpose of subjecting the Jewish people who stand in the front rank of Western civilization, to the rule of a set of unscrupulous Levantine politicians that this supreme Zionist effort is being made in Palestine. All the labours and sacrifices here owe to our inspiration to one thing alone: to the belief that this at least is going to mean freedom and the end of the ghetto. Could there be a more appalling fraud on the hopes of a martyred people than to reduce them to ghetto status in the very land where it was promised by the Balfour Declaration, national freedom? Those who advance such schemes know perfectly well that there is no prospect of their acceptance by the Jews. Their purpose is not to find a solution which would meet our ever more urgent need for a national home but on the contrary, to strangle our effort of national reconstruction.*

This means that the Zionist movement is content with nothing less than complete political and economic domination over Palestine and if possible, the whole of Western Asia as well as the late King Ibn Saud once stated: **Israel is a cancer and the welfare of the Muslims cannot be assured until this malignancy is competely destroyed!**

**Trial and Error*, Chaim Weizmann, Schocken Books, New York, 1966, pp. 394-395.

Who is a Jew? Although there has been much controversy and debate on this, the question has never been satisfactority resolved.

The nefarious effects of enthnocentricity upon the quality of Israeli life must not be underestimated. It comes to the head in the problem of religion. Since Israel is officially defined as a "Jewish State," the issue revolves around the crucial question: "Who is a Jew?" No other issue has divided the Israelis so sharply and the controversy is still far from resolved.

What makes a man a Jew? Nationality? Race? Birth? Religion? Persecution by "others?" A combination of all or some of these factors? If Jewishness is a nationality, can there be Christian or Muslim Jews? If it is a community of race, then this cannot be decided by the individual to opt in or out of it. If it is free-will, is Jewishness a daily plebiscite? If it is a religion, does not preclude free thinkers who would thus be only incomplete Jews? Does it preclude Christians and Muslims who tie their fate to that of the Jews by marrying a Jew? If religion determines the Jew, which faction within the religion makes for the determination? For as a faith, Judaism is splintered and lacks central authority. Who then is a Jew?

Steeped in the liberal tradition of nineteenth century European nationalism, most of the early Zionists envisaged a thoroughly secularized state. Their behavior was often demonstratively and sometimes foolishly anti-rabbinical. In the early 1920's a group of young atheistic pioneers marched to the Wailing Wall on The Day of Atonement (Yom Kippur) eating pork sandwiches. Ben Gurion married his wife, Paula, in a civil ceremony in New York; he later refused, on principle, to undergo a religious ceremony as well. Histadrut-owned workers' restaurants

refused for long time to maintain kosher kitchens, again on principle. Many pioneers refused to be "Jewish" in any but a national sense. As late as 1948, the idea of God was still a source of considerable embarrassment. In the proposed Israeli Declaration of Independence, all explicit reference to God was deleted from the draft. Instead, the signers of the Declaration put their trust in "the Rock of Israel". The vague reference is open to many ambiguous interpretations. Earlier Zionists had bluntly dismissed the possibility of a theocracy for as Theodor Herzl wrote in *Der Judenstaat*, "If faith keeps us united, science makes us free." As in other fields, reality proved stronger than the dream.

The Israeli Declaration of Independence stipulated full equality for all citizens "irrespective of religion, race and sex." It prescribed not only freedom of religion but also at the insistence of the liberals and secularists, freedom of conscience. This part of the Declaration of Independence, is no longer regarded by the Israeli courts as binding; but merely expressing the "credo and vision of the people" which carries no constitutional authority.

In the case of "mixed" marriages, simplified conversion procedures might have meant some relief from undue burden. But easy conversion to Judaism run counter to the age-old aversion to proselytising. Conversions merely to facilitate marriages between Jews and Gentiles are not approved by their rabbis; only after irrefutable proof of exceptional piety and meticulous ritual observance is a candidate accepted into Judaism. Hence the paradox that born Jews who are atheists, who never attend synagogue, who consistently violate the Sabbath, who eat pork and do not keep a *Kosher* home, have their marriages easily approved by the Rabbinate but Gentiles who would like to convert in order to become a Jewish marriage partner must first "prove" they never touch pork or smoke a cigarette on the Sabbath. Moreover the Tel-Aviv Rabbinate has in

recent years performed conversions only after first checking the police for "security reasons," the implication is that non-Jews, even if they be Israeli citizens, might be security risks.

In the aftermath of the 1967 war, a formal religious ruling was issued by the Sephardic Chief Rabbi of Israel, Yitzchak Nissim, prohibiting the evacuation of Arab areas occupied by Israel in that war. The prohibition was issued as a *psak halacha* which in Judaism is comparable to a papal bull or encyclical. The *psak halacha* enjoined all Jews as individuals from "even contemplating" the return to the Arabs of any territory that was included in "God's promise to His people." Fortunately, only a small minority of Israelis have recognized the Rabbis' authority to make such an intervention.*

Today the Jews pride themselves above every thing else in their successful survival as a people despite one persecution and massacre after another over the ages designed to exterminate them. They never tire of boasting how triumphantly they have survived while countless other nations much more powerful in wealth and in numbers have become extinct. What is the secret of this survival ? In his pioneer work in sociology *The Muqaddimah* Ibn Khaldun (d. 1406) declares that the survival of a people, culture or society is wholly dependent upon the cohesiveness and compactness of their "*asabiyah*" or feeling of group solidarity. When this "*asabiyah*" or group solidarity weakens, the eventual extinction of the people is inevitable. According to *The Muqaddimah* this group solidarity is most intense among tribal peoples like the *bedu*. The Jews who are

**The Israelis,* op. cit., pp. 428-436.

essentially a tribal people adhering to a tribal faith and (Judaism being tribalism in perhaps its most highly developed and sophisticated form) have somehow been able to perpetuate this group solidarity to a degree unparalleled by any other people. Religion among the Jews has served to strengthen, re-enforce and most important of all, justify in their own eyes, their nationalism and racism. Even when a Jew abandons Judaism, he still remains a Jew by nationality, culture and inheritance. Throughout history, Jews have demonstrated their willingness to betray all else, but rare indeed is a Jew who betrays another Jew. **In no other people can be found such intense group loyalty**. This explains the reason why Jews are so seldom converted to other religions. If a Jew loses faith in Judaism, his fellow-Jews will not much mind if he becomes an unaffiliated atheist and materialist, but woe is then betide the Jew who sincerely embraces Christianity or Islam; he will be subjected to a campaign of the most malicious slander; his family will disown and disinherit him and he will for ever be despised as a traitor to his people. Among strict Orthodox Jews, it is the custom for a family to mourn a relative converted to another faith as if he were dead.

Had it not been for this fanatical nationalist solidarity, certainly all or at least most of the Jews would have embraced Christianity or Islam. The Holy Quran explicitly states that the rabbis of Madinah knew that Muhammad (peace and blessings of God be upon him) was a true Prophet of God yet they savagely turned against him as his bitterest

enemy? Because Islam, claiming the identical prophetic inheritance, nullified and mercilessly exposed the whole fallacy of the Jews as God's special Chosen People. And today for the same reason, few Jews are courageous enough to condemn openly the atrocities Zionism has committed against the Arabs for the slogan of the Jews now as always is—"My people right or wrong!"

What is the real reason for the persecution against the Jews in medieval and modern Europe? If you ask any Jew this question, he will automatically reply that anti-Semitism as an incurable disease is proof of the perversity of the Gentiles. The Jews have refused to face the hard fact that the motivations behind all these centuries of persecution can be explained in thoroughly rational and psychological terms. A people who insist against all objective evidence to the contrary in regarding themselves as the Chosen People of God, who consider themselves innately superior all other peoples; who owe their loyalty primarily to each other and never to the country of their birth; and who while they may practice the most exemplary morality among themselves, feel no such obligations to the despised "illiterate Gentiles" and do their best to corrupt others though their stranglehold over the liquor business, usury, etc. and while they fervently maintain that Judaism is the only true faith, rigorously exclude outsiders. One of the chief duties of the rabbi is to discourage any would-be converts. How can such conceit, pride and exclusiveness not fail to arouse against them the most bitter hatred? On top of all that, there is the exceptional intelligence, clever-

ness and ability of the Jews to snatch the first opportunity to attain the maximum power and wealth at the expense of others which makes them feared as well as hated :

> When we sink, we became a revolutionary proletariat, the subordinate officers of all revolutionary parties ; and at the same time when we rise, there rises also our terrible power of the purse !*

In other words, the Jews have been feared throughout the ages because they are not content to participate with non-Jews on equal terms but *must dominate* everywhere !

The primary reason why Jews have never failed to arouse so much hatred against them is due to the fact that they have never outgrown their tribal mentality. According to this outlook, a man owes his loyalty only to his tribe and clan. All non-members of the tribe are outcasts and he is not held responsible or accountable for his conduct towards them. Within the tribe, his character and behaviour may appear most exemplary but once outside the tribe, he can turn to piracy, robbery and murder without suffering from the least qualms of conscience. Zionist propaganda never ceases to boast of the "progressiveness" of Israel in contrast to the "backwardness" of the Arab lands, never taking into account the fact that although from the economic, scientific and techno-

*The Jewish State*, Theodor Herzl, op. cit., p. 26.

logical standpoint, Israel may be as "advanced" as any European country, from the moral standpoint, "Israel is as primitve as the *bedu* of the Arabian desert. But while the *bedu* restrict their feuding to the wilderness and possess only the most rudimentary weapons to fight with Israel, with the most sophisticated, highly organized and efficient military machine in Western Asia is abundantly equipped for her imperialist ventures by America with Phantom jets and Hawk missiles. In a special interview with chief correspondent of *Time Magazine*, Israeli foreign Minister, Mrs. Golda Meir declared : "I oppose anyone who challenges Israel's moral right to occupy the Arab territories captured during the June 1967 war as essential for her military security. **The only morality which concerns us is the survival of the Jewish people in the Jewish state !** (Never mind, Mrs. Meir, about the survival, much less the welfare of any other people !) This is how the Jewish mind works and why Zionism is such a serious threat not only to the Arabs and Muslims but the peace of the world and the survival of the human race.

If the Jews nave been hated throughout the ages, it is only because their attitude and conduct towards non-Jews is positively hateful. Yet instead of facing this truth realistically as it is, the Jews prefer to wallow in sentimental self-pity, insist against all evidence to the contrary that they are innocent and that their sufferings are entirely caused by the faults of others.

Now the question arises : the Jews have indeed

survived *but survived for what purpose ?** None of the Jews I know inside or outside my family even think of that, least of all, answering it. Like modern Jews everywhere, they considered survival in the mere biological and secular political sense as entirely sufficient. What an irony of fate for this "nation of priests" whose sole mission as the "Chosen People" of God was to enlighten the world with the knowledge of His oneness and His divine commandments !

Even if the Jews had not succumbed to modern secularism and materialism and exchanged the faith of the Talmud for the most rabid brand of chauvinistic nationalism, what constructive purpose does this survival serve when we in Islam possess everything of value in the prophetic heritage of the *Bani Israel* without any of the corruption found in the Bible and an infinitely purer and nobler concept of monotheism unsullied by racist exclusiveness ? I did not

*In an article the former Israeli Prime Minister Yitzak Rabin claimed that because of the military aid Israel was receiving from the U.S,A., she was stronger than all Arabs combined. Rabin then begged President Carter to reverse his decision not to sell Israel the latest most highly destructive concussion bombs which exhaust all air over a wide area including the lungs of any living being. Mr. Rabin said Israel wanted the concussion bomb to maintain its air superiority against Arab weapon systems and ground missiles. He described it enthusia stica y as the perfect weapon for a country with a small army fighting enemies with large populations and can be thrown from the air to asphyxiate thousands of troops on the ground in minutes. Although Prime Minister Rabin expressed his disappointment with President Carter's wish to reduce the sale of sophisticated and devastatlng weapons across the world, he asserted Israel had no choice but to make the bomb itself. Israel's arms industry has already produced a variety of sophisticated weapons. "Israel Stronger than all Arabs Combined—Rabin," *The Sun*, Lahore Sunday, February 20, 1977.

embrace Islam out of any hatred or shame for my ancestral heritage or my people. My conversion was not motivated out of the desire to reject so much as to fulfil. I am now a Muslim by faith but I will always remain a Jew by birth—a fact of which I am neither proud nor ashamed. To me, the conversion from Judaism to Islam meant the transition from a moribund and parochial to a dynamic and revolutionary faith content with nothing less than universal supremacy for Truth by its very nature must be universal and open for all to share.

In the Hadith, our Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) warns us that in the last days before Resurrection, the Muslims will be guilty of imitating the Jews and Christians. This prophecy has been fulfilled. The wicked Muslims, who are so in little else besides their names, have been guilty of persecuting the genuine believers among us to a far more intense degree than the Jews, Christians, Hindus or atheists. In our early days, who were the greater persecutors of believers than Yazid, Hajjaj bin Yusuf, or Mamun ? It was no Jew or Christian who condemned our *Imams* like Ahmad Ibn Hanbal to be tortured in prison or Ibn Taimiya to breathe his last locked up in a dungeon. It was no Jew or Christian who was responsible for the martyrdom of Hazrat Uthman, Hazrat Ali or Hazrat Husain ! Who could have been greater traitors to our people than Khedive Ismail who sold Egypt to the British and the modern Muslim quislings in India today? Who are greater enemies of the *Shariah* than the Kemalist regime in Turkey, Reza Shah of Iran, the Nasser regime in Egypt, the

Ba'athist regime in Syria or Habib Bourguiba in Tunisia? Are they not guilty of committing the same crime of the distortion of the message of the Prophets, the scorning of the Divine revelation in attemping to dilute it with man-made changes, and "reforms," to suit worldly ends and the unprecedented persecution of all the *Mujjaddids* and movements for the restoration of the Divine Law ? Are those in charge of the destinies of the Muslims not guilty of all the crimes for which our Holy Quran has condemned *Bani Israil* before us? And will not the Divine wrath fall upon us as it has fallen upon the Jews unless we quickly repent and change our ways? We Muslims must learn from the Jews in order to escape their tragic fate. Let their destiny serve as a lesson and a warning for us never to follow in their footsteps.

# ISLAM VERSUS CHRISTIANITY AND ITS MISSIONARY ACTIVITIES IN MUSLIM LANDS

It is told of Edwin, the King of England, that when he was uncertain if he should become a Christian he gathered together the wise men of his kingdom and asked them whether or not they should adopt the religion of Christ.

"The life of a man," said an aged nobleman, "seems like the flight of a sparrow through the hall where men are feasting in the winter with a warm fire blazing on the hearth. But outside there is cold, rain and storm is raging. A bird flies in at the door. It tarries for a moment amidst the warmth and the light and then again, it vanishes into the cold and darkness outside. So it is with the life of a man. We tarry a moment on this earth, but whence we came and whither we go, we know not. If the new faith can teach us truly about these things, let us all follow it."

This wise advice pleased the King and his other nobles and so Northumbria became a Christian land. The converion of King Edwin took place in 627 A.D.

Thus the saintly scholar Bede (673-735), in his *History of the English Church and People*, most beautifully relates the reason why religious faith is indispensable to man. The advice given to King Edward is as relevant and sound to man today at the end of twentieth century as it was nearly

fourteen hundred years ago. All the revolutionary marvels of science and technology have not changed this instinctual need of man in his quest for the meaning and purpose of life which shall continue so long as the human race endures.

King Edward could not know that just at the time he embraced Christianity, the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) was establishing and consolidating Islam at the city-state of Medina throughout the Arabian peninsula. He embraced Christianity because no better alternative was available to him.

Although until the age of twenty-eight, when I migrated to Pakistan, I had spent my entire life in New York among Christians, I have never been attracted to Christianity. Despite my fondness for reading the stories about Jesus (peace be upon him) in the New Testament as a child, I always found utterly repugnant the following characteristics of this religion :

1. Almost from the outset, Christianity has proved itself unfaithful to its founder. Christian theology has no relevance or relation to the teachings of Jesus Christ (peace be upon him) even as recorded in the present versions of the New Testament. Even before I embraced Islam having been reared as a Jew, I could not but regard the Christian religion as hopelessly corrupted by Greek, Roman and Persian paganism from the very beginning. These pagan influences were never regarded by the Christian leaders as extraneous innovations to be condemned, resisted and combated but were all incorporated into the religion as essential dogma and practice. Christian

history is devoid of any counterparts to our great *Mujaddids* to resist innovation and preserve the purity of the faith intact.

2. The acceptance of Greek pagan philosophy has resulted in the incomprehensible and meaningless theology of Christianity. The Christian dogmas of the Triune God as Father, Son and Holy Ghost, the Incarnation of God into man, the doctrine of Original Sin which can only be erased by implicit faith in Christ as Redeemer and the entire ecclesiastical organization of the Church, both Protestant and Catholic, were as unpalatable to the Jewish mentality of my childhood as they are to the Muslim. In fact, very few Jews have become converted to Christianity because of sincere conviction as hardly any Jew could possibly reconcile himself to these dogmas. Most Jewish conversions to Christianity in the past have been motivated by an eagerness to escape discrimination and persecution or for a hunger for social acceptance among the "gentiles."

3. In Jewish and Muslim eyes, the most irredeemable defect in Christianity is its lack of Divine authority. The Gospels were merely four of the many apocryphical biographies written *about* Jesus (peace be upon him) in a language utterly foreign to him (Greek) which were not canonized until centuries after his alleged crucifixion. As for the Epistles, I could never understand why St. Paul's letters which were merely his own instructions to the various churches in the Roman Empire, should be canonized as "divinely inspired." The Muslim and Jew cannot but frown upon Christianity's astonishing readiness to accept

fallible human authority as infallible even on those questions which concern fundamental doctrine. Hence the priestly hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church, and the prevailing view among liberal Protestants that since every man is his own priest, we are absolutely free to believe and to do as we please! Even the most casual study of the history of Christianity reveals this religion to have evolved through the dictates of popes, saints, worldly kings and synods— thus **a purely man-made Religion!**

4. Because of St. Paul's rejection of the "Law" to be replaced by faith in Christ as redeemer of the sins of all mankind to make the religion acceptable to the Greek and Roman world, **Christianity is devoid of any complete code of Guidance as a determining factor in social and political affairs**. The Jew and Muslim are convinced that faith in God can have no effect on human life unless God is not only accepted as Creator and Redeemer but as an infallible Guide and Ruler. The laws of Judaism and Islam, so vehemently rejected by Christianity, are based on the premise that God has revealed through the Prophets an explicit Guidance as to how we should behave collectively as well as individually, and only by living as God wants us to live, can we hope to attain eternal salvation. Divine Law, especially relating to social affairs and politics, is regarded by the Christian as mere empty formality and ritualism while this comprehensive code governing all aspects of life in reality serves as the strongest bond of solidarity among us so that if Muslims from Indonesia visit Morocco, they are at once most

warmly welcomed with open arms as brethren-in-faith. Despite all its corruption with nationalism, Judaism fosters a similar group solidarity so that if Jews from any part of the world are afflicted with calamity, more fortunate Jews, though they may be from the other end of the earth, will immediately rush to their assistance. The Christian does not enjoy any such sense of belonging. If a Christian from Germany visits the Philippines, the most powerful Christian country in Asia, he is a complete foreigner. There is nothing to bind the Protestant in America to the Copt in Ethiopia.

5. Above all, what most repelled me emotionally was the complete historical identification of Christianity with Europe and Western civilization. As a child at the mere mention of the word "Christianity", I could only conjure up in my mind the horrors of the Spanish inquisition, the Crusades, the "pogroms" in Russia and Poland and the genocide of the Jews under Nazism which the Christian authorities did not attempt to resist or even protest. During my adolescence I found Christendom actively cooperating with Zionism, supposedly as a reaction to belated guilt-feelings on account of its past sins against the Jews. At this juncture I learned that Christendom in alliance with European imperialism, was the greatest enemy of the Arabs and the Muslims from the days of the Crusades onwards. Christian missionaries always preceded European conquest and domination in America, Asia and Africa, and with their educational and philanthropic organizations, did their best to sever the ties of the rising genera-

tions from their indigenous culture and wean them over to Western ways. I soon learned that Christian missionary activity was an integral part of the conspiracy for the westernization of the non-Western world. However obediently the "pagans" and "heathens" may westernize themselves in Christian missionary institutions, even if they accepted Christianity, *the white Christians of European origin would never accept them as equals!* Thus black Christians are subjected to the cruelest racial discrimination and persecution in such countries as South Africa and Rhodesia and even in America. Christians of African slave-origin very seldom pray in the same churches alongside their "white" brethren. In Christian churches, racial segregation has always been the rule. To make the hypocrisy of the Christian missionary activity in Asia and Africa complete, it is no secret that the overwhelming majority of Christians in Europe and America are thus only nominally. "Liberal" Christian sects like Quakers and Unitarians have long denied the concepts of prophecy, Divine revelation and reward or punishment in Hereafter on principle and now prominent theologians in America are debating the question as to whether or not God is dead! If the Christian missionaries were sincere, they would find more than enough work to do at home.

How far historical Christianity has strayed from the original teachings of its founder may be gauged by the following account by a well-known English historian ;

> A large proportion of the Christian world believes that Jesus was an incarnation of that God of all the earth whom

the Jews first recognized. The historian, if he is to remain historian, can neither accept nor deny that interpretation. Materially Jesus appeared in the likeness of a man and it is as a man that the historian must deal with him.

He appeared in Judea in the reign of Tiberius Caesar. All four Gospels agree in giving us a picture of a Prophet. He preached after the fashion of the preceding Jewish prophets. He was a man of about thirty and we are in the profoundest ignorance of his manner of life before his preaching began. Our only direct sources of information about the life and teaching of Jesus are the four Gospels. One is obliged to say : "Here is a man of a very definite personality. This could not have been invented." But just as the personality of Gautama Buddha has been distorted and obscured by the stiff squatting figure, the gilded idol of later Buddhism, so one feels that the lean and strenuous personality of Jesus is much wronged by the unreality and conventionality that a mistaken reverence has imposed upon his figure in modern Christian art. Jesus was a penniless teacher who wandered about the dusty, sunlit country of Judea living upon casual gifts of food; yet he is always represented clean, combed, and sleek in spotless raiment, erect and with something motionless about him as though he were gliding through the air. This alone has made him unreal and incredible to many people who cannot distinguish the core of the story from the ornamental and unwise additions of the unintelligently devout.

We are left, if we strip this record of these difficult accessories with the figure of a being, very human, very earnest and passionate, capable of swift anger and teaching a new and simple and profound doctrine—namely, the universal loving Fatherhood of God and the coming of the Kingdom of Heaven. He was clearly a person—to use a common phrase—of intense personal magnetism. He attracted followers and filled them with love and courage. Weak and ailing people were heartened and healed by his presence.....

For the kingdom of Heaven, as Jesus seems to have preached it, was no less than a bold and uncompromising demand for a complete change and cleansing of the life of our struggling race, an utter cleansing from without and from within. The Jews were persuaded that God, the only God of the whole world, was a righteous God but they also thought of Him as a trading god who had made a bargain with their Father Abraham to bring them to predominance in the earth. With dismay and anger they heard Jesus teaching that God was no bargainer; there was no chosen people and no favourites in the Kingdom of Heaven. God was the loving Father of all life, as incapable of showing favour as the universal sun. And all men were brothers—sinners and virtuous alike. All whom God take into the kingdom, he taught, God serves alike. There is no distinction in His treatment because there is no measure to His bounty. There are no privileges, no rebates, and excuses in the Kingdom of Heaven. And not only did Jesus strike at patriotism and the bonds of family loyalty in the name of God's universal fatherhood and brotherhood of all mankind but it is clear that his teaching condemned all the gradations of the economic system, all private wealth, and personal advantages. All men belonged to the same kingdom ; all their possessions belonged to the kingdom, the righteous life for all men. The only righteous life was to serve God's will with all that we had with all that we were. It was not merely a moral and social revolution that Jews proclaimed; it is clear from a score of indications that his teaching had a political bent of the plainest sort. It is true that he said his kingdom was not of this world, that it was in the hearts of men and not upon a throne but it is equally clear that wherever and in whatever measure his kingdom was set up in the hearts of men, the outer world would be revolutionized and made new.*

**A Short History of the World*, H. G. Wells, Walts and Co., London, 1934, pp. 140-143.

Let us now quote excerpts from the Gospels to examine the teachings and personality of Jesus Christ, (peace be upon him) in greater detail :

And Jesus went about all Galilee teaching in their synagogues and preaching the gospel of the Kingdom of Heaven and healing all manner of sickness and all manner of disease among the people. And his fame went throughout Syria and they brought unto him all sick people that were taken with diverse diseases and torments and those who were possessed by devils and those who were lunatics and those who had the palsy and he healed them. And there followed him great multitudes of people from Galilee....and from Jerusalem and from Judea and from beyond Jordan.... And seeing the multitudes, he went up unto a mountain and when he was still, his disciples came unto him. And he opened his mouth and taught them saying:

Blessed are the poor in spirit for theirs is the kingdom of heaven

Blessed are they that mourn for they shall be comforted.

Blessed are the meek for they shall inherit the earth.

Blessed are they who hunger and thirst after righteousness for they shall be filled.

Blessed are the merciful for they obtain mercy.

Blessed are the pure in heart for they shall see God.

Blessed are the peacemakers for they shall be called the children of God.

Blessed are they who are persecuted for righteousness' sake for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

Blessed are ye when men shall revile you and persecute you and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake.

Rejoice and be exceedingly glad for great is your reward in heaven for so persecuted they the Prophets who came before you....

Think not that I have come to destroy the Law of the Prophets ; I have not come to destroy but to fulfil for

> verily I say unto you till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in nowise pass from the Law till all be fulfiled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of Heaven but whosoever shall do and teach them the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven....*

In order, however, to make Christianity compatible to the Greek and Roman world, St. Paul, on his personal authority alone, took the fatal step of rendering almost the entire body of the Law of Moses nullified on the sophistry that "the letter of the law killeth but the spirit giveth life."

> Behold, thou art called a Jew and resteth in the Law and makest thy boast of God. Thou that makest thy boast of the Law though breaking the Law dishonorest thou God? For the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles through you as it is written. For circumcision verily profiteth if thou keep the law but if thou be a breaker of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision. Therefore if the uncircumcision keep not the righteousness of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision? What advantage then hath the Jew or what profit is there in circumcision? For Christ is the end of the Law for righteousness to everyone that believeth. For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call unto Him.**

St. Paul thus preached that men are not saved by their works but by their faith in Jesus Christ as having shed on the Cross his redeeming blood for the sins of all mankind. Thus, he argued, whoever believes in Jesus Christ as his Saviour, shall attain

**King James Version of Holy Bible.* Cambridge University Press, London, 1957; Matthew 4 : 23-25, 5 : 1-19.

***Ibid.*, Romans 2 : 17-26. 3 : 1, 10 : 4-12.

eternal salvation. Henceforth the prescriptions of the Law of Moses are annulled except, of course, the basic moral commandments. St. Paul never realized that although laws in themselves cannot compel men to be virtuous, as roads to that end by encouraging the right way of life, combined with a strong social backing, they certainly are indispensable for reducing the evils to a minimum. **True enough, Jesus had most vehemently condemned an arrogant adherence to the letter of the Law while at the same time violating its spirit but he never on that premise assumed, as Paul did that the entire body of the Law was useless!** Paul abolished circumcision and declared the consumption of swine-flesh, blood, carrion and the drinking of wine permissible for believers! On what authority, except his own personal convictions, did Paul have the right to declare the forbidden permissible? Even Jesus Christ (peace be upon him), whom Paul preached as the Incarnation of God, never claimed such pretensions. **The result of Paul's decision to discard the Law of Moses made Christianity what it is today—a religion *about* Jesus bearing little relevance to the actual teachings *of* Jesus. In other words, Christians since St. Paul's time have forgotten the message and instead taken to worshipping the Messenger!**

The mission of the Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) was no less than to restore the true faith of the Prophets in its pristine purity. As much as Jesus (peace be upon him) before him, Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon

him) denounced in the most vehement terms the arrogance, false pride and narrow-mindedness of the Jews. The Holy Quran and Hadith condemn the empty formalism and ritualism so characteristic among Jews in very explicit terms and the teachings of Islam declare its faith as a universal faith for all mankind as Christianity had done centuries before. But Islam parts company with Christianity in restoring the concept of ethical monotheism as Abraham and Moses had taught in its pure and unadulterated form. Jesus Christ (peace be upon him) is declared by the Holy Quran as true Prophet of God but rejected as part of the Trinity. The Quran declares that whoever believes in the Trinity instead of the Oneness of God cannot hope to attain salvation. But most important of all, **Islam came to restore the Law of Moses** (with certain modifications) **that the Christians had rejected as useless and obsolete.** Islam preaches that God is not only Creator, Sustainer and Redeemer but the **Ruler** and the only true Sovereign over the universe. God could not be Ruler unless He had revealed to the Prophets a complete *Guidance* as to how mankind should conduct life individually and collectively to obtain happiness and prosperity in this world and eternal salvation in the world to come. It is just this explicit guidance, so essential in Judaism and Islam, that Paul and his successors in the Christian church rejected, leaving the religion a mere matter of complicated theology, sacramental rituals combined, like Buddhism, with a strong streak of asceticism and monasticism. Since this religion, stripped of the Divine Law, was left so restricted and

fragmentary, the vacuum could be filled only by opening the flood-gates to paganism. Thus most of what is known as Christian theology, dogma, ritual, feasts and even the so-called "Christian calendar" is almost entirely of pagan origin:

Sun-worship was, at the time of the appearance of Jesus, the universally prevalent religion of the Roman Empire, though the names given to the sun-gods in various countries were different. The well-known sun-gods whose worship had been popular in the Mediterranean countries at one time or the other are : Attis of Phygia, Adonis of Syria, Dionysius or Bacchus of Greece, Mithra of Persia, and Osiris and Hours of Egypt. Brief sketches of the legends of these sun-gods will reveal the sources of Christianity.

**Attis**

He was born of a virgin named Nana and was regarded as the "Only Begotten Son and Saviour" He was bled to death on March 24th at the foot of a pine tree and his votaries believed that his blood and renewed the fertility of the earth and thus brought a new life to humanity. He, however, rose from the dead, and his resurrection along with h's death was celebrated by his votaries. Every year on th 24th day of March, they would first fasten his image to a pine tree and then lay it in a tomb with wailing and mourning. On the next day, they would find the tomb empty and celebrate the resurrection with great rejoicing. Scramental meals and baptism by blood were special features of his Church.

**Adonis or Tammuz**

He was the virgin-born "Saviour" of Syria. He suffered death for the redemption of mankind but rose again in the spring. His resurrection was commemorated by a great annual festival.

**Dionysius or Bacchus**

He was the "Only Begotten Son" of Jupiter and was born of a virgin named Demeter on December 25th. He

was a Redeemer, Liberator and Saviour. "It is I," so says Bacchus to makind, "who guide you; it is I who protect you and who save you. I am the *Alpha* and *Omega.*" Wine hau an important place in the festivals of his cult. He was slain for redeeming humanity and was called "The Slain One," "The Sin-Bearer," "The Redeemer." His passion play was celebrated every year representing his death, descent ito hell and resurrection.

**Bel or Baal**

He was the sun-god of Babylon and the story of his life is extremely astonishing in so far as a passion play has a very close resemblance with the Christian passion story even in details. The Jews had passed a long time in captivity in Babylon during the reign of Nebuchednazzar and this accounts for the close resemblance.

**Osiris**

He was born on December 29th of a virgin called by the Egyptians, "The Virgin of the World." He preached the gospel of gentleness and peace. Wine and corn were regarded as his celebrated discoveries. He was betrayed by Typhen, slain and dismembered. He was interred but came again to life after remaining in hell for two or three days and three nights. After his death, it was the custom of his votaries to keep his image in a box and bring out the image at the time of worship with the cries, "Osiris has risen!" Belief in the god-man in the form of Osiris became the chief element in Egyptian religion and remained for thousands of years the faith of the people through the tangled skein of religious life in Egypt until Osiris passed into the form of the god-man, Jesus Christ.

**Mithras or Mithra**

He was the virgin born sun-god of the Persians, the perfect prototype of Jesus Christ and the founder of an international Church in which Christmas and Easter were the two most important festivals. This divine saviour came into the world as an Infant. His first worshippers

were shepherds and the day of his nativity was December 25th. His followers preached a severe and rigid morality, chief among their virtues being temperance, chastity, renunciation and self-control. They kept the seventh day holy and the middle day of each month was a special feast of Mithra which symbolized the function of the Mediator. They had seven sacraments of which the most important were baptism, confirmation and Eucharistic supper at which the communicants partook of the divine nature of Mithra under the species of bread and wine. (pp. 58-61).

"Each of the major festivals of the Christian calendar," says a liberal Christian scholar of religion (Sir Richard Gregory in his *Religion in Science and Civilization*, p. 111) "carries on the tradition of the earlier pagan beliefs which the early Church, with a wisdom which still persists in Roman Catholic missionary efforts in its relations with primitive peoples, had adopted and transformed in the service of the Christian faith."

**Christmas**

A passing reference has been already made to the birth date of Jesus which is believed by Christians to be the 25th of December. But there are two well-established facts in this connection which demand a serious consideration. Firstly, this is the date of the Nativity of the Sun in the Julian Calendar. This and the neighbouring dates are connected with winter solstice which is accompanied by what was termed by the votaries of the sun-worship cults as the "birth" of the sun. Many a sun-god of the ancient world was born on this or neighbouring dates. Secondly, there are no proofs to locate the birth of Jesus on this date as admitted even by such a conservative Christian scholar as Dean Farrar. In fact it was not until the year 530 A.C. that Dionysius Exigus, a Schythian monk, abbot and astronomer, fixed the date of the birth of Jesus as December 25th **but he has not informed us on what authority he did so**. The fact that even today,

the Greek church observes Christmas on January 7th and not on December 25th is significant. Christmas, says Richard Gregory, is a pagan festival, which was adopted for the celebration of the Nativity about the middle of the fourth century in order to wean converts from pagan ceremonials taking place at that season. In Northern Europe it is the midwinter festival of Yule which the associations of the Yule log and Christmas fir tree would assign to a derivation from sun-worship. In Southern Europe it is mainly, though not solely, a festival of the mother-son worship (with a shadowy father, Joseph, in the background) as seen in the mangers of the Christmas celebrations of the Mediterranean people today which can be traced back through the ages as the dominant cult of the Mediterranean. An interesting point arises out of the celebration of Christmas as popularly observed in Britain. A double strain is to be observed. While the feastings and rejoicings of the Yule ceremony predominate, the manger, which is the most conspicuous feature of the popular celebration in Mediterranean countries, also appears in England with other associated customs. The two forms of celebration belong to entirely different systems of belief and it is cvident that in Britain, a double strain of tradition deriving from north and south has survived.

**Easter**

The festival of Easter (Anglo-Saxon, *Eostre*) derived its significance from the goddess of Light and Spring in the ancient world. Her festival, which fell after the vernal equinox (i.e. at the commencement of the spring season) was celebrated in Ireland and Egypt by distributing and eating eggs much in the same way as the Christians do today in commemoration of the resurrection of him whom they believe to have brought new life to humanity by giving his blood. Sir Richard Gregory remarks : "Use of the position of the celestial bodies to determine the dates of religious festivals

is represented by the celebrations of Passover and Easter." The Passover was celebrated by the Jews as a spring festival commemorating their exodus from Egypt and is regarded as the festival of freedom. According to Robertson Smith in the 14th edition of *Encyclopedia Britannica*, the Israelites, being a pastoral people, sacrificed the firstlings of their flocks in the spring as a thank-offering and when they settled in Palestine, they found there an agricultural festival connected with the beginning of the barley harvest which coincided in point of date with the Passover and was accordingly associated with it. This suggests a connection with the Pascal lamb on the fourteenth of the month. The first Christian observed the Jewish festivals but in a new spirit and the Passover with a new conception added to it of Christ as the true Pascal lamb. Easter, as shown by a number of customs and beliefs, is in the main, a festival of sun-worship as the sun begins to regain strength and the resurrection of Jesus coincides with the rejuvenation in the character of the young and vigorous spring.

**Sabbath**

That Jesus had come "not to destroy but to fulfil" the Judaic Law cannot be denied. How, according to that law, the day of Sabbath is Saturday and not Sunday which as *Dies Soli* was the holy day of the sun-god Apollo, the patron deity of the Roman Empire during Constantine's regime. Evidently Sunday was substituted only to perfect the resemblance between Christianity and paganism.

**Monks and Nuns**

The institution of monks and nuns has been similarly borrowed from Paganism. Buddhism had its monks and nuns and among the sun-worshipping cults, it had a very important institution in the cult of Mithra. The Mithrai monks used to have a distinctive symbol on the head, namely the tonsure—a bare circular space formed by shaving off the

hair and meant to represent the disc of the sun, their deity. ' The monks in the Roman Catholic Church of Christianity also observe this rite and this only proves Christianity to be derived from one of the many sun worshipping cults.

**The Cross**

Now we come to Christian symbols. The Cross did not originate with Christianity. It was not included in the early lists of Christian symbols as, for instance, the one prepared by St. Clement. It was first of all adopted as a symbol by Constantine who is alleged to have seen it in a vision. Among the sun worshippers in the Roman Empire, it was esteemed as the symbol of life and so it is with the Christians. There is an Egyptian cross in the Municipal Museum of Alexandria. Another non-Christian cross has been unearthed in Ireland. It belongs to the cult of Mithra and bears a crucified effigy (pp. 92-100).*

Even the so-called "Christian" calendar—nay, the very months of the year and the names of the days of the week—all in honour of Greek and Roman deities—is entirely pagan. The Christian weekly day of rest and worship is none other than Sun-day which is just as its name signifies. Monday is named after the moon : Tuesday was named after Tiu who was the Anglo-Saxon counterpart of the Nordic Tyre, son of Ordin, the God of War, Wednesday after Woden, the Nordic god of victory : Thursday after Thor who was the Nordic god of thunder ; Friday was named after Frigg, the wife of Woden, a goddess of love in Nordic mythology : and Saturday after the Roman god,

* *Islam and Christianity in the Modern World*, Fazlur Rahman Ansari al Qaderi, World Federation of Islamic Missions, Karachi, 1965.

Saturnalia. Similarly, the Church fathers sanctioned the naming of the months after the old Roman deities. January was named after Janus, the two-faced Roman god of doorways; March after Mars, the Roman god of war; May after Maia, an obscure goddess of Roman mythology ; June after Juno, another Roman goddess ; July after Julius Caesar while August was named after Augustus Caesar, the first Roman emperor. September is named after Septem which means in Latin, seven ; October named after octo, which means in Latin, eighth ; ninth, novo for November ; the December after decem meaning tenth. Thus every time we use the so-called "Christian" calendar, we are commemorating and perpetuating the pagan legacy of ancient Greece and Rome !

What do the chief Christian festivals mean to the average Christian in the West today ? In a London school, a teacher asked each of his fourth-grade pupils to write a short composition on how they would like to celebrate Christmas. The answers he received were most revealing. One nine-year-old girl wrote :

> I would like to spend Christmas day how I usually spend it, this is how I spend it. When I get up, I go down into the living room with my brothers and open my presents, then I have my breakfast and then have a wash and then get dressed and then watch television and then have my dinner which consists of baked potatoes, Garden peas, Turkey, Gravy, Mint Sauce, Greens and for my afters, I have Mrs. Peek's Christmas pudding and custard, then I watch television and then have my tea, then watch television and go to bed when I want to.

A boy said :

> ....I go to the movie pictures all morning, then I will

come back home, get my presents and then have my Christmas dinner and after that, sit in the sitting room and watch television and then go to bed.

Another girl in the class did not want to take any chances about her presents :

....for my Christmas presents I would like a hair-brush and comb set and some Make-up for my face like a Powder thing and some Red, Orange or Pink lipstick.

Still another girl with a touch of innocent realism adds:

....then I watch telly, then about twelve o'clock at midnight I get ready for bed with a shifting headache and a gums ache.

That was an unsampled selection; unedited and uniform. Apart from Mrs. Peek's Christmas pudding, it is only food, presents, television and headache ; nothing in the least to associate the occasion with the person or message of Christ. Christmas in Europe and America is no more than a neo-pagan ritual of permissive affluence. But, is this surprising?"*

Christian clergymen provide only the most unconvincing apologies for the saturation of their religion with paganism and secularism:

Canon C. H. Robinson admits the debt of pagan thought but regards it as a unique merit of Christianity. He says : "If Greek and Roman thought were needed for a full appreciation of the meaning of the Incarnation, why may we not say the same of Indian and Chinese thought? Surely we are justified in believing that every country and every people have something to contribute to Christianity and that the completion of the Christian *revelation* (?) awaits the con-

*Quoted from *The Muslim*, published by the Federation of the Students Islamic Societies in the United Kingdom and Eire, London, February 1968, pp. 111-112.

> tribution of each. We believe that there are many important aspects of the Christian truth which have never been understood simply because Christianlty has not yet been reflected in the experience of those nations of the world which are still heathen.*

This is a frank admission that historical Christianity was never a self-sufficient, explicit way of life but merely adopted the coloration of the peoples who became its nominal converts !

St. Augustine (354-430 A.D.), bishop of Hippo in what is now Algeria, one of the leading Church Fathers and a prolific author, in his framed *City of God,* inspired by the fall of Rome in 410 A.D. surprisingly has only the mildest reproof for Roman paganism. He looks forward to the salvation of the individual by the implicit acceptance of Christ as the Redeemer for the original sin of Adam in the life Hereafter. Any social or political reform had no place in his Christian programme:

> St. Augustine believed in a universal church comparable to the moon; he believed in particular churches as comparable to the stars. He held that a special authority resided in the particular churches founded by the apostles and among these, he recognized a primary or a still more special authority in the Roman Church. The Roman Church might therefore be particularly consulted for an authoritative pronouncement on disputed questions, though at the same time St. Augustine speaks of an appeal to a plenary council of the Church Universal. Roughly, we may say that he believes in a universal church as a single unit of Christian society; he believes in particular churches as units of organization; he allows a special authority to

**Studies in the Character of Christ,* Vol. IV p. 102 ; quoted from *Islam and Christianity in the Modern World,* op. cit., p. 109.

some and a still more special authority to one of these but he has no single church which is at one and the same time a unit of faith, of organization and of authority. What then shall we say of the relation between Church and State? The Church is a pilgrim society, living by faith and looking to the Hereafter. It lives on earth by the side of the State; it uses the *terrena pax* of the State; it acknowledges the divine institution and relative righteousness of the State. But it simply moves as a pilgrim past the grandeurs and dignities of this world, always looking beyond and always with eyes fixed elsewhere. What has a pilgrim to do with a king except to acknowledge that he is king, to render to him due obedience in matters of worldly peace and to pass on? The actual State as it really exists is not absolutely unrighteous. On the contrary, it has a sort of *justitia* of its own and not only so, but the citizens of the heavenly city of God avail themselves of the aid of this *justitia* in the course of their pilgrimage so that State, is thus in its way a coadjutor of the city of God. In order to understand this view of the state, we must recognise a distinction between absolute and relative righteousness. Absolute righteousness is a system of right relation to God—relation which are at once religious, moral and legal; relations which are in a word, total. Relative righteousness is a system of right relations mainly in the legal sphere and it is a system of right relations reckoning with and adjusted to the sinfulness of human nature. All the institutions of the State—government, property, domination of government over subjects, owners over property and masters over slaves are a form of public order and to that extent good; but the order is one conditioned by and relative to the sinfulness of the people **which makes absolute righteousness of the State and society impossible.***

Although from its historical origins, the Christian

*Introduction to St. Angustine's *City of God,* St. Ernest Baker, J. M. Dent & Sons, London, 1917, p. xvii.

Church has accepted secularism on principle, the steadfast adherence to the principle that God is the supreme authority over and above the secular state, has earned for it many martyrs. When the power of Rome ruled over the known world, thousands of Christians were martyred at the stake, on the cross or thrown to be eaten by the lions in the arena because of their determined refusal not to worship the Roman Emperor as a god or prostrate themselves in adoration before him. Among these martyrs may have been true believers. (God knows best). The early Christians must also be given the credit for their stiff opposition to the Roman "games" where hundreds of thousands of wretched human beings and beasts were slaughtered in the arena for the amusement of the bloodthirsty mobs. These "games"—which came to be the mainstay of the Roman economy—were the most spectacular sadistic orgies of all times. In 404 A.D. a monk named Telemachus leaped into the arena and appealed to the people to stop the fights. He was promptly stoned by the angry mob but his death ended the cruel spectacles. The Emperor Honorious was so enraged by the lynching that he closed the arenas. They were never reopened. This monk may have been a true believer. (God knows best).

> What man is more concerned about the Emperor than we are ? Who loves him more honestly than we ? For we pray incessantly for him that he may be granted long life and that he may rule the nations with a just sword and know an age of peace and plenty for his Empire. Then we pray for the welfare of the army and for the blessing of mankind and of the world. But we cannot sacrifice to the Emperor in the temple for who may pay Divine honours

to a man of flesh and blood ?

"Spoken around the year A.D. 250, on behalf of a Christian community by one of its leaders, these words state with typical forthrightness the attitude of the Church of the first three Christian centuries to the Empire. They embody the classic Christian concept of the relation of faith to citizenship, of Church to State, of the spiritual to the political—a ready obedience in all things lawful and honest, together with a fierce, uncompromising hostility to any State demands which flouted the rights of God. *The primitive Church had no desire either to subvert or disobey the imperial, civil power, even though identified as that power was with such monsters as Nero and Domitian.* But with that docility and acknowledgement of citizenship went a quite heroic defence of what had to do with faith and worship."*

Dr. Wilfred Cantwell Smith is even more explicit in his following explanation of Christianity's acceptance of secularism. In comparing the political programme of Islam with the secularism of Christianity, he writes :

> Christianity was launched upon a world already organized and the Christian Church's formative centuries were spent under somebody else's rule. Although Christianity served for a time in significant measure as the faith of the proletariat of the Roman Empire, the Christian religion was started in world that was already a going concern with its own secular laws and its languages, its government and economic structure. While Christians concerned themselves with their personal moral lives, the task of organizing a social order had long since been accomplished and the task of carrying it on rested on other people's shoulders.

**The Dome and the Rock : Jerusalem Studies in Islam*, Kenneth Cragg, S.P.C.K., London, 1964, p. 184.

> In practice, the social community of the Church had for three centuries little to say as to how history should proceed. **The ordering of the historical process was no part of the Christian program.** Even when the persecution ended and the Christians themselves came to constitute society rather than a minority on the defensive against it, and when in the historical flux, they themselves reached positions of responsibility and power, they took over the existing social order as they found it. They retained it, yet as something *extrinsic* to their faith. As Christians they might see their duty at most to improve it but not to replace it with something new.*

What was the result of the Christian church's permissive attitude towards political and social evils ? Let us glimpse in brief the history of the medieval papacy which reigned supreme over Europe for more than a thousand years :

> On the death of Pope Paul I, who had attained the pontificate A.D. 757, the Duke of Nepi compelled some bishops to consecrate Constantine, one of his bastard brothers as pope, but more legitimate electors, subsequently, A.D. 768, choosing Stephen IV, the usurper and his adherents were severely punished; the eyes of Constantine were put out, the tongue of Bishop Theodorus was amputated and he was left in a dungeon to expire in agonies of thirst. The nephews of Pope Adrian seized the successor, Pope Leo III, A.D. 795 in the street and forcing him into a neighbouring church, brutally put out his eyes and cut out his tongue; at a later period when this pontiff was trying to suppress a conspiracy to depose him, Rome became the scene of rebellion, murder and conflagration. His successor, Stephen V, A.D. 816, was ignominously driven out from the city; his successor, Paschal I, was accused of blinding and

***Islam in Modern History,* Princeton University Press, New Jersey, 1957, pp. 29-30.

murdering two ecclesiastics in the Lateran palace; it was necessary that the imperial commissioner should investigate the matter but the pope died, after having exculpated himself by oath before thirty bishops. John III, A.D. 872, unable to resist the Saracens, was compelled to pay them tribute; the Bishop of Naples maintained a secret alliance with them. John, now excommunicated, would not give him absolution unless he would betray the chief Muslims and assassinate others himself. There was an ecclesiastical conspiracy to murder the pope ; some of the treasures of the Church were seized and the gates of St. Pencrazia were open with false keys to admit the Saracens into the city. Formosous, who had been engaged in these transactions and excommunicated as a conspirator for the murder of John, was subsequently elected Pope, A D. 891. He was succeeded by Boniface VI, A.D. 896 who had been deposed by diaconate and again from the priesthood for his immoral and lewd life. After Stephen VII who followed, the dead body of Formosous was taken from the grave, clothed in the papal habiliment, propped up in a chair, tried before a council and the preposterous and indecent scene completed by cutting off three of the fingers and the genital organ of the corpse and casting it into the River Tiber ; but Stephen himself was destined to exemplify how low the papacy had fallen when he was thrown into prison and strangled. In the course of five years from A.D, 896 to A.D. 900, five popes were consecrated and deposed. Leo V, who succeeded in A.D. 904, was in less than two months thrown into prison by Christopher, one of his chaplains who usurped his place and who in turn was shortly expelled from Rome by Surgius III who by the aid of military force, seized the pontificate in A.D. 905. This man, according to the testimony of the times, lived in open incest with his niece and then the infamous prostitute, Theodora, who with her daughters, Marozia and Theodora, also prostitutes, exercised an extraordinary control over him. The love of Theodora was also shared by John

X; she gave him first the archbishop of Ravenna and then tranferred him to Rome A.D. 915 as pope. John was not unsuited to the times. By the love of Theodora, he had maintained himself in the papacy for fourteen years; by the intrigues and hatred of her daughter, Marozia, he was overthrown. She surprised him in the Lateran palace in shameful relation with his niece; killed his brother, Peter, before his face; threw him into prison where he soon died, smothered with a pillow. After a short interval, Marozia made her own bastard son Pope John XI, A.D. 931. Another of her sons, Alberic so called from his supposed father, jealous of his brother John, cast him and their mother, Marozia into prison. After a time, Alberic's bastard son was elected pope, A.D., 956. He assumed the title of John XII; the amorous Marozia thus having given two bastard sons and a bastard grandson to the papacy. John was only thirteen years old when he became head of Christendom. His reign was characterised by so many shocking immoralities that the holy Roman Emperor, Otto I, was compelled by the Germans to interfere. A synod was summoned for his trial in the Church of St. Peter before which it appeared that John received bribes for the consecration of bishops, that he had ordinated one who was but ten years old and had performed the ceremony over another in a stable. He was charged with incest with one of his father's concubines and with so many adulteries that the Lateran Palace had become a veritable latrine! He put out the eyes of one ecclesiastic and castrated another; he was given to drunkenness, gambling, sodomy and the invocation of Jupiter and Venus. When cited to appear before the council, he sent word that "he had gone out hunting" and to the fathers who remonstrated with him, he threateningly remarked that "Judas as well as the other disciples received from his master the power of binding and loosening but that as soon as he proved traitor to the common cause, the only power he retained was that of binding his own neck." Hereupon he was deposed and Leo VIII

elected in his stead A.D. 963 but subsequently getting the upper hand, he seized his antagonists, cut off the hands of one, the nose, finger, tongue and genitals of others. His life was eventually brought to an end by the vengeance of a man whose wife he had seduced. After such details, it is almost needless to allude to the annals of the succeeding popes ; to relate that John XIII was strangled in prison, that Boniface VII imprisoned Benedict VII and killed him by starvation ; that John XIV was secretly put to death in the dungeons of the castle of St. Angelo ; that the corpse of Boniface was dragged by the populace in the streets and outraged. Benedict IX, a boy of less than ten years, was raised to the apostolic throne in A.D. 1038. Of this pontiff, one of his successors, Victor III, declared that his life was so shameful, so foul, so excretable that he shuddered to describe it. He ruled like a captain of the banditti rather than a prelate. The people, at last unable to bear his adulteries, homicides and abominations any longer, rose against him. In despair of maintaining his position, he put the papacy to auction. It was bought by a presbyster named John who became Gregory VI in A.D. 1045. The Council of Pisa held in 1409 deposed two popes, rivals—Gregory and Benedict—that is to say, the actual Vicar of Christ and the pretender. This action was taken because a council, "enlightened by the Holy Ghost", could not distinguish the genuine from the counterfeit. The Council then elected another Vicar whose authority was afterwards denied. Alexander VI died and John XXIII took his place. When Gregory XII insisted that he was the lawful pope, John resigned. He was deposed and afterwards imprisoned. Then Gregory XIII resigned and Martin V was elected. Were these popes the vicegerents of God on earth—those who had truly reached the goal beyond which the last limits of human wickedness cannot pass ?*

*"An Open Letter to the Christian Churches," Aziz ul-Hasan Abbasi, *The Voice of Islam*, August 1963, Karachi, pp. 602-605.

But to present the history of the Church fairly, it must be stated that this is not the whole story. Medieval Christianity also had its brighter side. However wicked and corrupt some of the popes, cardinals and bishops may have been, the humble village priest, who had most intimate contacts with the comon people, was usually a kindly, self-denying and dedicated man. The majority of the monks and nuns in the early monasteries also set a worthy spiritual example for people. One of the most attractive books on Christianity I have ever come across : *A History of the English Church and People* by Bede, the eminent British priest and historian who lived from 673 to 735 A.D. His book covers the period from the Roman occupation of Britain to 731. Bede passed his entire life in the monastery, occupying nearly all his time with reading, writing and studying. Far from living in the "Dark Ages," Bede's writings depict a peaceful, tranquil, serene and thoroughly civilized society which we moderns today might well envy. Unselfconsciously he presents a vivid, appealing Golden Age of Faith where the dogmas and doctrines of Christianity required no apologetic defense or elaborate arguments in their favour for they were regarded by these people as facts of life and to believe in religion was as natural as to breathe.

Here is Bede's story from the life of Caedmon, the 7th century poet, the first to compose verses in the English language.

> In this monastery of Streanaeshalch lived a brother singularly gifted by God's grace. So skilful was he in composing religious and devotional songs that when any

passage of the Scripture was explained to him by interpreters, he could quickly turn it into delightful and moving poetry in his own English tongue. These verses of his have stirred the hearts of many folk to despise the world and aspire to heavenly things. Others after him tried to compose religious poems in English but none could compare with him; for he did not acquire the art of poetry from men or through any human teacher but received it as a free gift from God. For this reason he could never compose any frivolous or profane verses but only such as had a religious theme fell fittingly from his devout lips. He had followed a secular occupation until well advanced in years without ever learning anything about poetry. Indeed, it sometimes happened at a feast that all the guests in turn would be invited to sing and entertain the company; then when he saw the harp coming his way, he would get up from the table and go home.

On one such occasion he had left the house in which the entertainment was being held and went out to the stable where it was his duty to look after the beasts. Then when the time came, he settled down to sleep. Suddenly in a dream he saw a man standing behind him who called him by name. "Caedmon!" he said, "sing me a song." 'I don't know how to sing,' he replied, 'It is because I cannot sing that I left the feast and came here.' The man who addressed him then said 'But you shall sing to me.' 'What should I sing about?' he replied. 'Sing about the Creation of the World.' the other answered. And Caedmon immediately began to sing verses in praise of God, the Creator that he had never heard before and their theme ran thus:

Praise we the Fashioner now of Heaven's fabric,
The Majesty of His might and His mind's wisdom,
Work of the world-warden, worker of all wonders,
How He, the Lord of Glory everlasting,
Wrought first for the race of men, Heaven as a rooftree,
Then made He Middle Earth to be their mansion.

This is the general sense, but not the actual words that Caedmon sang in his dream; for verses, however masterly, cannot be translated literally from one language into another without losing much of their beauty and dignity. When Cademon awoke, he remembered everything that he had sung in his dream and soon added more verses in the same style to a song truly worthy of God.

Early in the morning he went to his superior in the monastery and told him about this gift that he had received. The monk took him before the abbess who ordered him to give an account of his dream and respeat the verses in the presence of many learned men so that a decision might be reached by common consent as to their quality and origin. All of them agreed that Caedmon's gift had been given to him by our Lord. And they explained a passage of scriptural history or doctrine and asked him to render it into such verse as he could. He promised to do this and returned next morning with excellent verses as they had ordered him. The abbess was delighted that God had given such grace to the man and advised him to abandon secular life and adopt the monastic state. And when she had admittcd him into the Community as a brother, she ordered him to be instructed in the events of sacred history. So Cademon stored up in his memory all that he had learned and turned it all into such melodious verse that his delightful renderings turned his instructors into his admirers. He sang of the creation of the world, the origin of the human race and the whole story of Genesis in the Bible. He sang of Israel's exodus from Egypt, the entry of the Hebrews into the Promised Land, and many other events of scriptural history. He sang of the Lord's Incarnation, Passion, Ressurection and Ascension into Heaven, the coming of the Holy Spirit and the teachings of the Apostles. He also composed many poems on the terrors of the Last Judgement, the horrible pains of Hell and the joys of the Kingdom of Heaven. In addition to

these, he composed several others on the blessings and judgements of God by which he sought to turn his hearers from delight in wickedness and to inspire them to love and to do good. For Caedmon was a deeply religious man who humbly submitted to regular discipline and hotly rebuked all who wanted to follow another course. And so he crowned his life with a happy End.

For when the time of his death drew near, he felt the onset of physical weakness for fourteen days, but not seriously enough to prevent his walking or talking the whole time. Close by there was a house to which all who were sick or likely to die were taken. Towards nightfall on the day when he was to depart from this life, Caedmon asked his attendant to prepare for him a resting-place in this house. The attendant was surprised at this request from a man who did not appear likely to die yet; nevertheless, he did as he was asked. So Caedmon went to the house and conversed and jested cheerfully with those who were already there; and when it was past midnight, he asked. 'Is the Eucharist in the house"?

'Why do you want Eucharist?' they enquired, 'you you are not likely to die yet when you are talking so cheerfully to us and seem to be in perfect health.' 'Nevertheless,' he said, 'bring me the Eucharist.' And taking it in his hands, Caedmon asked whether they were all charitably disposed towards him and whether they had any complaints of ill-feeling against him. They insisted that they were all most kindly disposed towards him and free from all bitterness. Then in turn they asked him to clear his heart of bitterness towards them. At once he answered, 'Dear sons, my heart is at peace with all the servants of God.' Then when he had fortified himself with the heavenly Sacrament, he prepared to enter the other life and asked how long it would be before the brothers roused to sing God's praises in the Night Office. 'Not long,' they replied. 'God, then let us

wait until then', he answered and signing himself with the holy Cross, he laid his head on the pillow and passed away quietly in his sleep. So, having served God all his life with a simple and pure mind, and with tranquil devotion, he left the world and departed to God by a tranquil death.*

This is medieval European Christendom at its best. Now let us again glimpse the dark side which prevailed before St. Benedict (480-547 A. D.) removed the excesses from the monastic movement.

Simeon Stylites' life of extraordinary austerity is guaranteed by the testimony of his friends and disciples. A Cilician shephard lad, born about 390 A. D., Simeon entered a monastery at the age of thirteen. Ten years later, he moved to another remarkable for its austerity, where he outfasted monks who ate only once a day by eating only once a week. A rope of palm leaves which he wore twisted around his body was betrayed by a stinking sore. It could be removed only by excisions which left him unconscious. Thc abbot expelled him, Living now in a hermitage below a mountain, he began a custom, continued for at least twenty-six years, of passing Lent without food or drink. At the end of three years, he returned to the summit where he built an enclosure open to the sky.

To remove himself from the throng of visitors by whom he was increasingly beset, for he had become a miracle-worker, Simeon decided to live on top of a Pillar raised progressively in height from about ten to sixty-seven feet. Its diameter did not exceed six feet and as it was without a seat, his sole relaxation from standing upright was to stoop or lean. He made constant bows of reverence and wore an iron collar.

**A History of the English Church and People*, Bede, translated from the original Latin by Leo Sherley-Price, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 1955, pp. 250-253.

The neighbouring abbots and bishops suspected that he had adopted such mortifications from pride but when he prepared to obey an order to descend, they encouraged him to remain on his pillar. Far from being an uncouth fanatic, he showed unruffled patience, gentleness and kindness to all. Yet in his last years, he suffered from a secret ulcer in his foot. Friends aud disciples attest to his miracles and virtues. He died on July 22, or September 2, 459 A. D.

Though the first, Simeon was by no means the last Stylite, from the word, "stylos" which in Greek, meant a pillar. He was followed in oriental Christendom by a long succession of pillar saints extending over many centuries.

To us moderns, such a life of self-torture is repellent. But it suited the mentality of its environment and made Simeon a successful and far-reaching evangelist of Christian faith and morality. He preached daily to crowds. The Arabian bedouin from the surrounding deserts flocked to hear him. Persians, Armenians, Georgians thronged around him. A delegation of peasant-farmers arrived from an Egyptian village. He bade the fellaheen to share the irrigation waters justly. Emperors consulted him and asked his prayers. The Byzantine emperor, Marcian visited him incognito. He persuaded the Empress Eudoxia to abandon the Monophysite heresy. To St. Genevieve, remote in the far west, he sent greetings and a request for prayers. Thus the Stylite proved himself God's messenger for Christianity to the people in an age so different from our own.*

The annals of the medieval Roman Church are filled with the tortures the Saints and mystics inflicted upon themselves in the name of Christ. Here is an

**The Saints: A Consise Biographical Dictionary*, edited by John Coulson, Guild Press, New York, 1957, pp. 687-688.

extreme example taken from the autobiography of the fourteenth-century German mystic, Suso as he himself described his experiences in the third person :

> He was in his youth of a temperamemt full of fire and life and when this began to make itself felt, it was very grievous to him and he sought by many devices how he might bring his body into subjection. He wore for a long time a hair shirt and an iron chain until the blood ran from him so that he was obliged to leave them off. He secretly caused an undergarment to be made for him and in it, he had strips of leather fixed into which a hundred and fifty brass nails pointed and filed sharp were driven and the points of the nails were always turned towards the flesh. He had this garment made very tight and so arranged as to go round him and fasten in front in order that it might fit closer to his body and the pointed nails driven into his flesh. In this he used to sleep at night. To emulate the sorrows of his crucified Lord, he made himself a cross with thirty protruding iron needles and nails. This he bore on his bare back between his shoulders day and night. The first time that he stretched out this cross upon his his back, his tender frame was struck with terror at it and he blunted the sharp nails slightly against a stone. But soon, repenting of this womanly cowardice, he pointed them all again with a file and placed once more the cross upon him. He did his penance by striking this cross and forcing the nails deep into the flesh and thus he scourged his body. At the same time, he procured an old castaway door and he used to lie upon it at night without any bedclothes to make himself comfortable. He thus procured for himself a most miserable bed for the hard pea-stalks lay in humps under his head, the cross with the sharp nails struck into his back, his arms were locked fast in bonds, the horsehair undergarment was around his loins. His feet were full of sores, his legs dropsical, his knees bloody and his loins covered with scars from the horsehair,

> his body wasted and mouth parched with intense thirst and his hands tremulous from weakness. Amidst these tortures he spent his nights and days and he endured them all out of the greatness of the love which he bore in his heart to the Divine and eternal wisdom, our Lord Jesus Christ whose agonizing suffering, he sought to imitate.*

It may come as a relief to the reader that after his fortieth year, God showed poor Suso in a series of visions that he had sufficiently broken down the "natural" man that he might leave these exercises off.

In the Roman Church every monk or nun must take solemn vows of povertv, chastity and unquestioning obedience. The Benedictine Rule deems it essential that the monk or nun be totally dispossessed, convinced that private property is the root of Evil. Says St. Benedict whose Rule is followed in most Roman Catholic convents to this day :

> For their bedding, let a mattress, a blanket, a coverlet and a pillow suffice. These beds must be frequently inspected by the Abbot because of private property which may be found therein. If anyone be discovered to have what he has not received from the Abbot, let him be most severely punished. And in order that this vice of private property may be completely rooted out, let all things that are necessary be supplied by the Abbot : that is, cowl, tunic, stockings, shoes, girdle, knife, pen, needle, handerchief and tablets so that all plea of necessity may be taken away. And let the Abbot always consider that passage in the Act of the Apostles, "Distribution was made to each according as anyone had need."

*_The Life of the Blessed Henry Suso_ by himself, translated, by T. F. Knox, London, 1865, pp. 56-80, abridged.

The life of the monk or nun in the Roman convent requires total self-renunciation. St. John of the Cross, a Spanish mystic who flourished or rather who existed for there was little that suggested flourishing about him—in the sixteenth century will supply an apt passage from his spiritual autobiography to elaborate on this subject :

> First of all, carefully excite in yourself an habitual affectionate will in all things to imitate Jesus Christ. If anything agreeable offers itself to your senses, yet does not at the same time tend purely to the honour and glory of God, renounce it and separate yourself from it for the love of Christ who all his life long had no other taste or wish than to do the will of his Father whom he called his meat and nourishment. For example, you take satisfaction in hearing of things in which the glory of God bears no part. Deny yourself this satisfaction, mortify your wish to listen. You take plessure in seeing objects which do not raise your mind to God ; refuse yourself this pleasure and turn away your eyes. The same with conversations, and all other things. Act similarly so far as you are able with all the operations of the senses striving to make yourself free from their yokes.
>
> The radical remedy lies in the mortification of the four great natural passions—joy, hope, fear and grief. You must seek to deprive these of every satisfaction and leave them as it were in darkness and the void. Let your soul therefore turn always :
>
> Not to what is most easy but to what is hardest ;
> Not to what tastes best but to what is most distasteful :
> Not to what most pleases but to what disgusts ;
> Not to matter of consolation but to matter for desolation.
> Not to rest but to labor ;
> Not to desire more but less ;

Not to aspire to what is highest and most precious but what is lowest and most contemptable ;

Not to will anything but to will nothing ;

Not to seek the best in everything but to seek the worst so that you may enter for the love of Christ into a complete destitution, a perfect poverty of spirit and an absolute renunciation of everything in this world.

Embrace these practices with all the energy of your soul and you will find in a short time great delights and unspeakable consolations.

Despise yourself and wish that others should despise you.

Speak to your own disadvantage and desire others to do the same.

Conceive of a low opinion of yourself and find it good when others are told of the same ;

To enjoy the taste of all things, have no taste for anything ;

To know all things, learn to know nothing.

To possess all things, resolve to possess nothing.

To get to where you have no taste for anything, go through whatever experience you have no taste for,

To learn to know nothing go wither you are ignorant.

To reach what you posess not, go whitersoever you own nothing.

To be what you are not, experience what you are not.*

This is how life in the convent interprets the Beatitude, "Blessed are the poor in spirit for they shall see God:"

If any of you will know whether or not he is really poor in spirit, let him consider whether he loves the ordinary consequences and effects of poverty which are hunger, thirst, cold, fatigue and the denudation of all conveniences.

**Saint John of the Cross: His Life and Works*, Paris, 1893 Vol. II, pp. 94-99 abridged.

See if you are glad to wear a worn-out habit full of patches. See if you are glad when something is lacking to your meal, when you are passed by in serving it, when what you receive is distasteful to you, when your cell is out of repair. If you are not glad of these things, if instead of loving them, you avoid them, then that is proof that you have not attained the perfection of poverty of spirit. The first point is that which St. Ignatius Loyala proposes in his *Spiritual Exercises* when he says: 'Let no one use anything as if it were his private possession. A religious person ought in respect to all the things that he uses to be like a statue which one may drape which clothing but which feels no grief and makes no resistance when one strips it again. It is in this way that you should feel toward your clothes, your books, your cell and everything else that you make use of; if ordered to quit them or exchange them for others, have no more sorrow than if you were a statue being uncovered. In this way, you will avoid using them as if they were your private possession. But if when you give up your cell or yeild possession of this or that object or exchange it for another, you feel repugnance and are not like a statue, that shows that you view these things as if they were your private property. And that is why our holy founder wished the superiors to test their monks and put their poverty and their obedience to trial and by this means they may become acquainted with the degree of their virtue and gain a chance to make ever farther progress in perfection. Making the one move out of his room when he finds it comfortable and is attached to it, taking away from another a book of which he is fond or obligating a third to exchange his garment for a worse one. The ancient fathers of the desert used often thus to test their companions.

'*Pratique De La Perfection Chretienne*, Alfons Rodriguez, Part III, Treatise V, Chapter X. quoted from *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, William James, The New American Library, New York, 1958, pp. 248-249.

Said St. Ignatius Loyala in his *Spiritual Exercises* in emphasizing the necessity for absolute, blind and unquestioning obedience of the novice to his superiors advised :

> I ought on entering the religious life to place myself entirely in the hands of God and of Him who takes His place by His authority. I ought to desire that my Superior should oblige me to give up my own judgment and conquer my own mind. I ought to set up no difference between one Superior and other but recognize them all as equal before God whose place they fill. For if I distinguish persons, I weaken the spirit of obedience. In the hands of my Superior I must be a soft wax, a thing from which he is to require whatever pleases him, be it to write or receive letters, to speak or not to speak to such a person or the like; and I must put all my fervor in executing zealously and exactly what I am ordered. I must consider myself as a corpse which has neither intelligence nor will ; be like a mass of matter which without resistance lets itself be placed wherever it pleases any one; like a stick in the hand of an old man who uses it according to his needs and places it where it suits him. I must never ask of the Superior to be sent to a particular place, to be employed in a particular duty. I must consider nothing as belonging to me personally and as regards the things I use, be like a statue which lets itself be stripped and never opposes resistance.*

The Holy Rule of St. Benedict recommends the following penance for an erring monk :

> As punnishment, let the refractory monk lie prostrate at the door of the oratory in silence and thus with his face to the ground and his body prone, let him cast himself at the feet of all others as they go forth.

**Quoted from The Varieties of Religious Experience, Ibid.*, pp. 246-247.

In her book, *A Nun's Story*, (London, 1957) Katherine Hulme, an ex-nun, has poignantly described the degrading ceremonies which a novice must endure:

> For the penance of "begging soup" on the left of the Mother Superior, she placed her pottery bowl, knelt, clasped her hands and waited until two spoonfuls of soup had been put into her beggar's bowl, then on to the next eldest and the next until the bowl was filled. When at last her bowl was filled, she returned to her place and swallowed the soup, as she knew she must, to the last drop. She tried not to think how it had been tossed into her bowl from a dozen other bowls that had already been eaten from. She blanked out from her facial expression the revulsion that rose up in her fastidious soul as she drank the dregs. One look of rebellion she knew would be enough to invite a repetition of the awful abasement which she was sure she could never go through again, not even for the sake of the Blessed Lord Himself. (pp. 52-53).

Here is how human relationships are nullified in the nunnery as described by Katherine Hulme :

> The bravest of the emotionally vulnerable were the sisters who stood up together in the *culpa* and denounced each other for having gone out of their way to be near to one another, or perhaps for having talked together in recreation in a way that excluded others. Their tormented but clearly confessed disclosures of a nascent affinity gave it the *coup de grace* which they themselves might not have been able to do unless the entire convent would henceforth see to it that these two would be kept far apart. The pair would be helped to detach themselves from one of these spontaneous personal attachments which often spring to life in the body of the community as unexpectedly as wild flowers appeared now and then in the formal geometric patterns of the cloister gardens. (pp. 50-51).

Thus it is that the cloistered nun and monk, denied all normal expression of their sexual needs through marriage, envision themselves as married to Christ or married even to God, the Father Himself. St. Teresa of Avila (1515-1582) and St. Gertrude (d. 1298) fill their autobiographies of detailed descriptions of their erotic visions in mystical communion with the Divine. They imagined themselves as the bride betrothed to Christ, the Bridegroom and told of their marital union with the Sacred Heart of Jesus. One day when suffering from a headache, St. Gertrude sought for the glory of God, to relieve herself by holding certain odoriferous substances in her mouth when the Lord appeared to her to lean over towards her lovingly and to find comfort Himself in these odours. After having gently breathed them in, He arose and said with a gratified air to the Saints, as if contented with what He had done; "See the new present which my betrothed hath given Me!"*

What is the purpose of these mortifications? Thomas Merton, a convert who became a Trappist monk, writes in his autobiography, *The Seven Storey Mountain* (Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York, 1948):

> The meaning of the contemplative life and the sense of all the apparently meaningless rules and observances and fasts and obediences and penances and humilations and labours that go to make up the routine of existence in a monastery all serve to remind us of what we are and Who God is—that we may get sick of the sight of ourselves and turn to Him and in the end, we find Him in ourselves, in our own

**The Varieties Of Religious Experience*, op. cit., p. 269.

> purified natures which have become the mirror of His tremendous goodness and of His endless love. (p. 372.)

The extremes of morification by these Christian hermits bear a striking similarity to the self-tortures of the Hindu anchorites in India. The possibility of the example of the latter influencing the former cannot be entirely ruled out. Like Hinduism and Buddhism, Christianity regarded asceticism, monasticism and celibacy as the highest ideals : St. Paul wrote :

> Now concerning the things whereof ye wrote unto me, it is good for a man not to touch a woman. Nevertheless to avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife and let every woman have her own husband. Defraud ye not one another except it be with consent for a time and that ye may give yourselves to fasting and prayer and come together again that Satan tempt you not for your incontinency. But I speak this by permission and not of Commandmant. For I would that all men were unmarried even as myself. I say therefore to the unmarried and widows. It is good for them if they abide single even as I. But if they cannot contain, let them marry for it is better to marry than to burn. (First Corinthians 7 : 1-9)

In Islam, as in Judaism, marriage is regarded as the Divinely ordained state for every normal man and woman after puberty. Our Holy Prophet said that "marriage is the practice of my *Sunnah* and whoever does not follow my *Sunnah* does not follow me." Another Hadith praises marriage as perfecting half the Muslim's faith. As for the practice of asceticism, our Holy Quran says:

> Then We caused Our messengers to follow in their footsteps and We caused Jesus, the son of Mary, to follow and gave him the Gospel and placed compassion and mercy

in the hearts of those who followed him. **But monasticism they invented. We ordained it not for them—only seeking Allah's pleasure and they observed it not with right observance.** So We give those of them who believe their reward but many of them are evil-livers. (LVII ; 27).

Let us now examine how the ideals of celibacy, asceticism and monasticism have been exemplified in the lives of the most important saints of the Roman Catholic Church:

**St. Augustine** : (354-430)

St. Augustine was born in Numidia (now Algeria). His parents were probably both native Berbers. His father, Patricios, a small landowner and town counselor, was a pagan though he became a Christian at the end of his life. His mother, St. Monica, was a Christian and it was she who by her prayers and her unwearing patience and affection was responsible more than any other human being for her son's conversion. St. Augustine was in fact baptised by St. Ambrose only after his conversion when he was thirty-two. He went through the usual educational course of Latin and Greek literary studies of his time and eventually began to practise as a rhetorician at Carthage. At this period he became a Manichee, attracted by the intellectual pretensions of Manichaeism. In 383 he went to Rome as a teacher of rhetoric and in 384 obtained a post at Milan. At Milan he came into contact with the city's Bishop, St. Ambrose and he became intellectually convinced of the truth of Christianity but held back from any decisive step till in September 386, when he underwent the great experience of instantaneous conversion which he describes unsurpassably in the eighth book of his *Confessions*. It was a conversion both to Christianity and to *the pursuit of Christian perfection by an ascetic life*. After he gave up his profession of rhetorician, he retired near Milan with his mother, Monica where he was baptised by St. Ambrose

on Easter 387 and started back with his mother and friends to Africa when his mother died on the way. In Africa he was persuaded by Bishop Valerious to become a priest and was ordained in 391. He spent the remaining thirty-five years of his life as a hard-working diocesian bishop, somehow finding the time to write his *Confessions* and his main theological work. *The City of God.* He lived a monastic common life with his clergy and did all he could to encourage the formation of religious communities. He wrote two sermons on ascetic communal life and a long letter on its principles to a community of nuns he had founded, from the so-called 'Rule of St. Augustine' which is the basis of the rules of a great many communities of priests, friars and nuns. **He always had wine at common meals as a respect for the good gifts of God ;** perhaps he remembered the perverted puritanism of his Manichaean days. St. Augustine lived to see the savage Vandal invasion of Africa which began in 429 and died on August 28, 430 at the age of seventy-six while the Vandals were besieging his episcopal city of Hippo. (pp. 88-91)

**St. Benedict:** (480-547)

St. Benedict, patriarach of Western monasticism, was born during the turbulent period when the Goths, who were Arian heretics, had established a kingdom in Italy and were striving to defend it against the Emperor's great general Belisarius. In 546 the Gothic king, Totila who figures in St. Benedict's life story, captured the city of Rome, left it in ruins and deserted it for forty days. Justinian's armies finally won a victory so costly that the historian Gibbon wrote that the deliverance of Rome was the last calamity for the Roman people. Such was the setting where St. Benedict established the monastic system which was to preserve religion, art, science and agriculture for Europe throughout the Dark Ages. The decadence of Rome horrified the young Benedict who had been sent there to complete his education. He fled the city two or three years later knowing

only that God was calling him to the life of a monk or a hermit. After a brief stay with some holy men about thirty-five miles distant from Rome, he set off once more, this time quite alone to adopt the life of a solitary anchorite. Having received the monastic habit, which in those days was nothing but a sheepskin, he buried himself in a cave and there endured a three-year probation of silence, penance and prayer. This was the type of monasticism which had arisen in the East in the third century. The accent was laid heavily on penance which often reached exaggerated and unbalanced extremes. It was St. Benedict's achievement to modify this system and to evolve a form suitable to the West. At some date between 520 and 530, St. Benedict set out from Subiaco with a few companions, reached Cassinum, destroyed the pagan temples he found there and established the world-famous abbey of Monte Cassino. Here he settled down for the remainder of his life and wrote the *Rule* of monasticism which was to dominate Western religious life for 600 years. St. Benedict laid his emphasis upon communal, celibate life. He divided the monk's day between prayer, studies and manual labor. He mitigated the austerities of the Egyptian desert, urging the abbot of the monastery, whose rule was absolute, to "temper all things so that the strong may still have something to long after and the weak may not draw back in alarm." If no detail of monastic life was too trivial to interest him—from the clothes and shoes of the brethern to their portions of food and drink—the virtues he specially enjoined were those of obedience and humility. He knew how to govern and if necessary how to punish, but love was the principle of the community life of the monastery. For St. Benedict, God is to be found everywhere and in all things—in the abbot and his brethren, in the guests and pilgrims, in the divine office which is the monk's principal duty and even in the spades and hoes which he uses for his field work. His sister, St. Scholastica, founded a separate order for nuns. (pp. 110-113).

**St. Dominic : (1170-1221)**

St. Dominic Guzman, founder of the Dominican Order of friar preachers, was born in Castile, Spain. Until he was thirty-five, he led a cloistered and studious life. He studied first under his uncle, arch-priest of Gumiel, then for ten years at the Universitv of Valencia. Pope Innocent III had long been looking for men to carry out the work of preaching in the south of France to counteract the influence there of the Albigensian heretics who taught that everything material was evil and of the devil, including the institution of marriage. Pope Innocent III sent Dominic and his friend, Diego to the south of France where they tried by preaching to convert the heretics. After one of their preachers was assassinated, the Catholic lords launched a civil war of rebellion against the Albigensians, and Dominic was left preaching where he could, matching the austere example of those who assisted him by his own exacting mortifications. 'A man who governs his passions is master of the world,' he said. 'He must either rule them or be ruled by them. It is better to be the hammer than the anvil." At Pouille, France, he founded a religious community of nuns—all converts from heresy, now almost his sole support. Although he had only six companions, yet he proposed to Pope Innocent III that they should form a world-wide order of preachers. St. Dominic immediately dispersed his followers, now sixteen in number, throughout Europe and he himself travelled the whole of the continent on foot organizing the order. (pp. 234-237).

**St. Francis of Assisi : (1181-1226)**

He was born in France but spent most most of his life in Italy. His father was a prosperous merchant but a greater influence in his childhood and boyhood came from his devout and loving mother. He was gay, adventurous, generous and popular and though prepared to follow his father's trade, he dreamt also of a knight's career. In

1201 he took part in a war where he was taken prisoner aud remained a hostage for a year. This experience and a severe illness began the process of his conversion. Halted from further military service by a dream in which Christ called him to preach, he returned and gave himself up to the care of the sick. On April 26, 1206 he heard again the voice of Christ in a vision calling him to rebuild the Church of San Damiano. Always impetuous and whole-hearted, he renounced his old life and adopted that of a hermit and when his father first imprisoned him and then brought him before the local bishop as a disobedient son, he abandoned all his rights and possessions even to his clothes. Two years later, he heard at a mass, Christ calling him to the preaching of penance. When his companions numbered eleven, he wrote for them a Rule of monastic life and in 1209, led them to Rome to seek approval from the Pope. Innocent III, after a short hesitation, had the insight to see in this single-minded, ardent layman, a true apostle and gave a verbal permission in June 1210. The brotherhood returned to Assisi and preached penance throughout cental Italy. It was the golden age of simplicity when the friars turned their hands to every kind of work or lived on gifts of food ; they had as example and guide the spiritual wisdom and angelic simplicity of Francis who in 1212 encouraged Clare, a girl of noble family in the city, to found a sisterhood of nuns living in poverty and prayer ; they became "The Poor Ladies," now "The Poor Clares." In 1219 his brotherhood of monks and nuns, fast growing unwieldly, was divided into provinces and the first great missions were sent across the Alps. With a complete disregard of any prudential considerations, Francis left Italy to join the Crusades against the Muslims in Palestine and win his way into the presence of the Sultan. Having failed, Francis, broken in health, retired into the mountains and on September 14, 1224 experienced the mysterious visitation that left upon his body the marks of the sacred wounds (or Stigmata) of Christ which remained with him as an acute

physical suffering for the rest of his life. Henceforward his maladies increased and he became almost blind. He was borne from place to place by his disciples. In 1224 he wrote *The Canticle of the Sun,* wherein he repeated with solemn emphasis his teaching of absolute poverty, literal obedience to the monastic Rule and the refusal of all privileges. Francis was a man of extreme simplicity. He had only one aim—to love Christ and to imitate him and his life perfectly, even literally. (pp. 296-300).

**St. Thomas Aquinas :** (1225-1274)

St. Thomas Aquinas was born in Naples. He was educated at the near-by monastery of Monte Cassino and then at the University of Naples and while still an undergraduate, he decided to become a Dominican. Henceforth all his energies were directed to teaching, explaining and defending the Catholic faith. St. Thomas lacked the universal interests of his master, St. Albert. He was, for instance, not much concerned with the thirteenth century revival of experimental science that Albert fostered but in philosophy and theology, he achieved a depth of understanding and an ease of exposition unequalled even in that century of genius. From his early studies in Naples and later from St. Albert, he quickly realized the importance of the knowledge of Aristotle that came through the new translations made first from Arabic versions and later (largely on Thomas' insistence) from the original Greek. On the one hand, St. Thomas had to persuade those followers of Averroes (Ibn Rushd) that better reasoning could show where Aristotle was mistaken and on the other hand, he had to persuade the over-cautious that much of Aristotle was sound and invaluable for the theological task of seeking to understand the truths of faith. His masterpiece the *Summa Theologica,* is an unsurpassed synthesis of the Latin and Greek church traditions illuminated by the use of philosophical reasoning drawn from Aristotle and Plato. His sanctity was achieved in and through the main work of his life—his intellectual activity. (pp. 722-725).

**Ignatius Loyola :** (1491-1556)

He was born in the Basque hill country in Spain, the youngest of eleven children of an ancient noble family. He received only a superficial education in youth. His interests at that time were in gaming, in affairs of gallantry and, above all, in feats of military prowess. During the war between Spain and France, his thigh was fractured by a cannon-ball. He bore the pain with fortitude and it was during his long subsequent convalescence that finding no other literature, he passed his time reading the lives of the saints. Their example fired him to emulate them. "Supposing," he said, "I were to do what St. Francis and St. Dominic have done?" He then resolved to become a knight in the service of God. In 1522 when he recovered, he found his way to the shrine of Our Lady of Monstserrat where he made a three-day confession, gave his knightly apparel to a beggar and hung his sword upon an altar of Our Lady. He composed *The Spiritual Exercises* in which he wrote down the principles by which a Catholic should regulate his life to attain his goal which is to praise the Lord so that he shall be saved. The following year, he made a pilgrimage to Palestine, stopping on the way at Rome. After he had venerated the Holy Places in Palestine, he returned to Barcelona. There, though now over thirty, he went to school, sitting on the same bench beside little children in order to repair the gaps in his education until he was fit to proceed to the University of Salamanca. On the Feast of Assumption 1534, he and six disciples solemnly dedicated themselves to the service of God, taking vows of poverty, chastity and obedience. Their intention was to go to Jerusalem and devote themselves to the salvation of souls in infidel countries. When circumstances made this impossible, Ignatius concluded that it was not the will of God that they should make that journey. Instead, he put his Order under the title of *The Society of Jesus* (now known as the *Jesuits*) at the disposal of the Holy See (papacy). The *Jesuit* Order added to the three customary vows of poverty,

> chastity and obedience, a fourth of special obedience to the Pope. Ignatius hardly left Rome for the rest of his life but the expansion of the *Jesuit* Order under his leadership was little short of miraculous and by the time of his death in 1556, it numbered twelve provinces, a hundred and one houses and nearly a thousand members. (pp. 370-373).*

These men have long been considered by Roman Catholics, which comprise more than half of the nominal Christians throughout the world, as exemplifying the highest ideals of spirituality as well as being the most decisive personalities who shaped the course of the history of Christianity in Europe. Note that all were celibate; all were bishops, priests or monks, regarding asceticism as the noblest kind of life. Had they been born in India instead of Europe, these saints might have found a congenial atmosphere among the Hindus or the Buddhists in neighboring lands.

And here is a modern example of the Roman Catholic ideals of spirituality :

> In Mexico, sorrow is not considered heartbreaking, pitiful or disfiguring. It is considered to be a mark of God's favor by which one is enobled and purified. Pain must be borne as a mark of God's love since only through pain may we share any part of the Passion of His crucifixion. The man or woman wracked with pain or borne down by sorrow stands close to the Man of Sorrows and spiritually at least, is to be envied by those of us who are safe and and soft in our comfort and happiness. I cannot pretend that I learned this attitude at once. And it was years after I had come to understand it that I took it for my own. Indeed, the first

**The Saints : A Concise Biographical Dictionary*, edited by John Coulson, Guild Press, New York, 1957.

argument I had with my mother-in-law was on the same subject. I had cried wildly that I would never suffer some dreadful, incurable disease; that I would kill myself first. But she turned on me with great severity and said in words I have never forgotten, "No, Elizabeth! You will accept your debts to life when and as God sends them and you will pay them, every one!"

One of our dearest friends was a wealthy, gay and cultured lawyer, Don Eleazar. He had enjoyed a wonderful life. He had traveled the world over. He knew every part of his own Mexico and he was at home in the great cities of Europe and the United States. He frequently took as many as ten or twelve relatives with him on long tours abroad. He entertained lavishly and set his table with delicate foods and fine wines.

When he was in his early sixties, he had a series of digestive upsets. He grew worse. An exploratory operation was recommended. It was learned that he had inoperable cancer of the liver.

He had been a devoted Catholic all his life, a member of the lay order of the Franciscans. Now his faith became all his life to him. He ordered his wife, relatives and doctors to give him no opiates to dull his senses or kill his consciousness. "God has been good to me, lavish with His gifts. Now He awards me the greatest gift of all. I am to be permitted to share, in small measure, His pain. I who have adored Him in every way I know, am to be allowed to approach Him. It is as if I were offered the glory of the Stigmata. Blessed be God."

And so it was.

I recount this because I feel that no amount of study of the Indian races, careful cataloging of handicrafts and music and research into the language and history of Mexico can give a true picture of the soul of Mexico until a man like Don Eleazar is understood in his deeply proud and valiant mysticism. This type of character was sent to Mexico by

Catholic Spain and is still part of the country in every stoical and spiritual Mexican. And there are millions of them who, against this measure of their faith, judge every action of their lives and weigh every custom, tradition and activity.*

The teachings of Islam do inculcate into the hearts of the pious Muslim, exemplary patience under affliction and courage to face every kind of adversity that is beyond our personal control to avoid, but in contrast to the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church, Islam does not regard suffering or calamity necessarily as a virtue in itself

The intimate relationship between the monastic ideals of Christianity and its implicit acceptance of secularism on principle is eloquently illustrated by one of the leading Christian missionaries to the Muslims—Dr. Kenneth Cragg :

> Many Muslim writers, past and present, upbraid Christianity for its failure to discipline and control Western civilization. It has not checked imperialism or prevented exploitation. It is, on the contrary, implicated as aiding and abetting Western dominance in the world. The Church in the New Testament is conceived as a society within a society. It is never properly thought of as coterminous within history with the whole of human society. It is built upon the idea of redemption. It therefore involves an analysis of human nature as wayward and sinful. There is the "natural man" in his recalcitrance and the "spiritual man" in regneration and pardon. The Christian understanding of how man is perfected is that it happens personally and through faith. Goodness, truth

**My Heart Lies South : The Story of My Mexican Marriage,* Elizabeth Borton de Trevino, Thomas Y. Crowell Company, New York, 1953, pp. 232-234.

and love are not actualized in terms of the natural man but of new-made man. These conditions of the transition, being personal, **are not social.** Christianity belongs to and inheres in pepole who believe. It is never coterminous with any given society or culture. Things are not the final locus of Christianity. People are. **The gospel of grace does not suppose that man is perfectable by law.** The Christian mind believes that the society of the redeemed will always stand within the community—never identical with the whole. *That whole, the secular world, must be free to organize itself.* We cannot by legislations or assertion identify it with Christ. This fundamentally is the reason why the Christian faith recognizes an ultimate distinction and in that sense, a separation between Church and State. Christianity agrees with Islam that the claims of God are total and that nothing is exempt from their relevance. It does not agree that they can be met in a religio-political order externally established. Thus the Christian fellowship of people discipled to Christ as Master and Savior is not identical with a total population. In regenerating its fellows as far as it can and resisting the un-Christian as far as it may, it does not expect to identify itself with the whole, because true faith cannot be compelled. A community which confronts men with decision cannot at the same time be a community that recruits them all. **Christianity is not a political expression.** Realist Muslims have recognized that the Islamic law has not at any prolonged time in history evoked a true Islamic society. There has always been disparity between what was and what might have been. Does the "totalitarian" religion aim to dominate society and insure obedience by state authority and enforcement or does it seek to permeate opinion and rely solely on persuasion? Is there any sense, not harmful to religion in which the political order should be free from religious dominance? If religion sets the criteria of the state and of society, what is its true function in relation to these being actualized? Some Muslims today are by no means

> as confident as their forebearers that the right way to serve the unlimited demands of the religious law is by the unlimited enforcement of religious sanctions. To belong to Christ is to take up the Cross, to undertake costly responsibility for the world, to bear witness against social evil and strive for economic justice on all sides. To recognize that changing social conditions do not change man is not to be indifferent about changing them.*

This is the kind of sophistry whereby the learned Christian doctor tries to apologize for secularism. Christianity has had almost 2,000 years to "regenerate" the world and convert the "natural man" into the "new-made" man, but **what has been it result ?** Christianity reigned unchallenged over Europe for more than a thousand years, but the Church proved itself more intolerant and bigoted them any other institution in history. Wherever the Church ruled, every effort was made to exterminate Jews, Muslims, Protestants and other "heretics" whose legal rights to to exist were not even recognized.

> The problem of power—national, independent, and Islamic—is the heart of contemporary history in most of the areas of the world of Islam. It is a problem inherent in filling the vacuum left by a retreating political west. It searches the intellectual resources of Islam in the most radical manner. As any observer can see, it is all accentuated by the vast, exacting questions that attach to modern society. Almost everywhere Islam is revising the classical legal framework of its fourteen centuries. This has all kinds of attendant consequences. It bring a new type of lawyer to the fore and relegates many of the old uiceties and their exponents to unimportance. It brings about a

*_The Call of the Minaret_, Kenneth Cragg, Oxford University Press, New York, 1956, pp. 323-7.

silent transformation in the whole idea of *Ijtihad* or legal innovation and who is fitted to exercise it. It remodels the structure of courts and alters the mentality of litigants. It revises the concept of women and invades the innermost sanctuaries of personal status and family. Alongside it are the far-reaching economic transformations of daily life and commerce, the passing of barter economies, the emergence of the hitherto unknown phenomenon of leisure, the rise of collective bargaining and trade unions, the growth of mass-media and thus of communal opinion, new attitudes to time, to wealth, to privilege, new criteria of status, new dimensions of citizenship, new vistas of opportunity and wide new problems of adminstration of public welfare. In the vacuum left by the lapses of the Caliphate is the recession of imperialism. The current suspension of democratic forms in the Muslim world not only arises from the fact that government in these days of high dams, flooding populations and industrialization must be direct and efficient; it springs also from the fact that democratic processes to be secure, require standards of general education and traditions of citizenship that often do not obtain and for lack of which more democratic processes play into the hands of exploiters and vested interests. Moreover, viable and valid democracy demands a vigorous party system and the concept of the dignity of opposition—elements still wanting, for a variety of reasons in the structure of most Islamic communities. There is the bewildering newness of the political situation itself. The old Caliphate has departed. It is now four decades extinct and shows no sign of being resuscitated. The sundered national entities which replaced it or, as in Africa east and west, have developed outside of it, are launched upon their own careers when governing involves so much more than Caliphs ever knew.*

**The Dome and the Rock : Jerusalem Studies in Islam*, Dr. Kenneth Cragg, op. cit., pp. 189-190.

**The blackest page of the history of the Roman Catholic Church was the Inquisition whose shadow cast a virtual reign of terror over Europe for centries.**

It is one of the bitter ironies of history that the Church, which had abolished torture as a legal device in the fifth century was the institution to revive it almost, a thousand years later. Although the Church regarded heresy as the most terrible of crimes—"treason against God"—it doubted that force was the best way to deal with it. When the Spanish heretic, Priscillian, was sentenced to death in 385 A.D. by the Emperor Maximus, St. Martin, St. Ambrose and St. Leo protested. St. John Chrysostom felt that to "put a heretic to death would be to introduce upon earth an inexcusable crime."

In the 13th century, heresies began springing up all over Europe like mushrooms in a garbage heap. The most prominent of these sects was the Albigences in the south of France who attempted to return to what they considered the purity of early Christian doctrines. Pope Innocent III ordered a crusade against them, Arnaud, the papal legate told the crusaders: "Kill everyone! God will recognize His own!" Although the crusaders did their best to follow these instructions, this sort of wholesale butchery was plainly impractical and so St. Dominic, the founder of the Dominican Order and an expert theologian, was sent to France to examine prisoners and determine their religious beliefs.

From a strictly theological point of view, St. Dominic was not unreasonable. He first made sure that the individual being questioned was really a heretic—many of the Albigenses were really protesting more against the corruption of the local clergy than against the basic doctrines of the Church. But if the prisoner was definitely denying basic Catholic doctrines, Dominic would spend days if necessary arguing obscure theological points in an effort to convert the sinner. If the prisoner remained obdurate—well, as Dominic himself

said, "When kind words fail, blows may avail." Dominic argued that one heretic would corrupt others. Such a man, could not therefore be allowed to adhere to his false doctrines any more than a man afficted with the plague should be allowed to infect others. Torture until the heretic recanted or died, was the only solution.

The Alibigenses were soon virtually exterminated, 200 being burned at Montsegur in one day. But other sects continued to appear and so in 1233, a perpetual board of inquiry was established to investigate cases of suspected heresy. As heresy was considered the most terrible of all crimes, the board was permitted to use torture as a standard procedure to discover the truth, a custom that was gradually adopted by the secular courts as well. The Church court become known as the Inquisition and was put under the supervision of the Dominican Order.

The Inquisition made torture more than merely a method of inflicting pain; they transformed it into an art and science. Great emphasis was put on the psychological approach preceding the actual torture. The accused was arrested at night, pulled out of bed by the black-robed, masked familars and taken to the dungeons in utter silence. Here he was left for several days in solitary confinement and complete darkness. When he was judged to have reached the breaking point, the same masked figures suddenly seized him and dragged him to the torture chamber.

Here, behind a long table sat other mysterious figures with the accused's records spread out before them. The floor of the room was covered with sand or sawdust to soak up the blood and around the wall were arranged the torture instruments painted red or black. The torturers, naked to the waist and wearing black masks stood among the terrible tools of their trade with folded hands. The only light came from flickering candles. On the walls were inscribed mottoes such as "Say nothing but good of the dead." or "Dark theatres are suitable for dark deeds."

The prisoner was not told what charges were laid against him. He was only told to confess. If he did not or could not, the, Inquisitor-General warned him. "Remember that you do not pass into our hands for an hour or a week or even a year but until the day you die and even then you will spend eternity suffering the pains of Heil." If the prisoners still proved obdurate, he was handed over to the executioner who usually began by telling him : "We will torture you until you are so thin that the light will shine though you !" Then the torture commenced.

The first torture was the garrote. The prisoner was stripped naked, for the executioners required access to every portion of the body. A belt was then fastened around his waist and he was suspended from the ceiling. Cords were twisted around various parts of his body and slowly tigh-tened in the manner of a tourniquet. As one part of his body began to grow numb, he was turned by means of the belt into another position so new cords could be applied.

If the garrote failed, the Inquisitors then had recourse to the strappado. The victim's hands were tied behind him and he was then hoisted up by his wrists to a pulley on the ceiling. For maximum effect the prisoner was raised slowly and allowed to stand on tiptoe for the length of time it required to say a psalm Miserere three times slowly. He was then lowered, circulation allowed to return and hoisted up against with weights attached to his feet for two Miseres. If this failed, he was raised almost to the ceilling and suddenly allowed to drop but brought up with a sharp jerk that dislocated his arms at the shoulders. Should he still refuse to confess, weights were tied to his legs and he was pulled up to be dropped again.

The water torture was considered the most terrible and used when other means had failed. The prisoner was tied to a ladder with his head lower than his feet. An iron prong was used to force his mouth open and a strip of linen was pushed down his throat. Water was slowly dropped on the linen until the prisoner, in his efforts to avoid being

strangled, swallowed the strip. The strip was gradually withdrawn, covered with blood and mucus. The process was then repeated. The amount of water used was carefully measured and could never exceed eight quarts at any one time; otherwise the prisoner might suffocate.*

The Inquisitors were ruthless as they were convinced that they were fighting with the powers of darkness for the prisoner's soul. For the victim to die unrepentant was a victory for the devil. It is astonishing that the Inquisitors, many of whom were sincere and intelligent men, never seemed to realize that the accused would usually admit to anything under torture. As the accused had no conception of what crime he was supposed to have committed, he would often beg the Inquisitors to tell him so he could confess. This was never done because the Inquisitors wished the confession to be "voluntary." A clerk was always employed to take down a transcript of the accused's testimony during the torture.

The Inquisitors frequently claimed that the confessions extracted by torture must be genuine because the prisoners seldom retracted afterwards and legally, torture could not be repeated, so the prisoner had nothing more to fear. They neglected to point out that torture could be "interrupted" and then "reversed." The torture was never officially ended even when a confession had been secured. It was merely interrupted and in case of a retraction, could be continued. The Inquisition was full of legal quibbles of this nature.

In 1488, Pope Innocent VIII issued his famous bull against witchcraft, ordering the Inquisitors to stamp it out at all costs. Jacob Spregner was appointed Inquistor-General of Germany. He accepted the appointment eagerly. His famous book, the *Malleus Malaficarum* (Hammer of

*All of these methods of torture invented by the Inquisition, combined with electricity, are standard routine in prisons today inflicted on political prisoners throughout the modern world.

Witches) is said to have caused the deaths of more human beings than any other book in history. As did most of people of his time, Sprenger considered virtually all mental aberrations as being the work of the devil or of his agents, the witches. In his *Malleus Malificarum*, Sprenger described literally every kind of neurosis or psychosis which we find today in modern psychiatric practice. Victims of schizophrenia typically rebell against authority and frequently launched wild attacks against God. To Sprenger, such people were clearly witches. He describes how the "witches" hear voices, have dreams and illusions and how some were actually cured by torture. Hysterical anesthesias and pathological mutism could be cured by his "shock treatment" and the witches who responded to Sprenger's drastic therapies were clearly of these types.

Sprenger's famous *Hammer of Witches* was used for centuries after his death as the definitive text on witchcraft and how to secure confessions. As it provided unshakable legal grounds for convicting anyone arrested, it was invaluable to a witch-hunter.

The Inqusitors had scriptual authority for their actions. The Biblical order: Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live." (Exodus 22 : 18) has probably been responsible for the death of more persons than any other eight words in history. W. F. Poole in *Salem Witchcraft* believes that hundreds of thousands of people were killed for this "crime" during the 16th and 17th centuries. Witchcraft executions continued into the 18th century.

The greatest of all inquistors—the man whose name has become virtually synonomous with torture as a fine art—was Frey Tomas de Torquemada. Torquemada created the Spanish Inquisition and made it one of the most terrible institutions in all history. In so doing, he virtually exterminated the Spanish middle class and so crippled Spanish trade and commerce that it never completely recovered. He burned 10,220 and tortured 97,321 during his eighteen years

of office, yet this fearful man lived a life of self-sacrifice and humility. He never ate meat, wore only his monk's robe of coarse cloth and slept on a plank. As Inquisitor-General he acquired great wealth but used it only to establish churches and convents.

As a young man Torquemada was subjected to two psychological blows. Although of noble birth, his grandfather had married a wealthy Jewess to recoup the dwindling family fortunes. As a child Torquemada was taunted by his schoolmates for not having "clean" blood, so that even the meanest of his class-fellows considered himself to be superior to the "polluted" boy. Torquemada grew up with a pathological hatred for Jews who had inflicted this disgrace upon him. Then he fell in love with a beautiful girl named Cazilida. As Cazilda was of Spanish-Christian ancestry, the brilliant student was able to forget the shame of his mixed blood. But then Cazilda ran away with a handsome Moor, the descendant of one of the ancient Moorish families who had ruled Spain since the 8th century.

Torquemada never recovered from this second shock. Twice he had been disgraced ; first, by the Jews and then by the Moors. Half mad, he went to his confessor, Father Lopez, a Dominican. Father Lopez urged the crazed youth to enter the Church. "There alone you can find solace, my son. Retreat from this world full of unreason and carnal desires, and devote your great talents to God."

"I will do as you say, Father, and dedicate myself to the abolition of heresy." he promised.

Hitherto the Inquisition in Spain had been merely an investigating group but in 1481, Torquemada burned 800 heretics—mainly Muslims and Jews. Torquemada travelled about the land, protected by a bodyguard of forty armed familiars on horseback and 200 on foot. These familiars were secular monks, usually the younger sons of wealthy noble families who by joining the Inquisition, became exempt from all taxes and enjoyed almost unlimited powers.

> On arriving in a new community, Torquemada would invite the populace to report anyone suspected of being a heretic. Suspects could be identified if there was no smoke rising from their chimneys on a Saturday (thus implying that they were observing the Jewish Sabbath) or if they ate meat during Lent, changed their sheets or underwear on a Saturday, cut the fat off meat or if any of their relations when dying, had turned their faces to the wall. Informers were reminded that they received one third of the accused's estates and property. The accused were tortured until they confessed and gave the names of other heretics. It was admitted that this method involved the danger of convicting innocent persons but as Friar Francesco Pregna, a noted Inquisitor pointed out : "After all, should an innocent person be unjustly condemned, he should not complain of the sentence which was founded on sufficient proof and we cannot judge on what is hidden. He should accept the sentence with resignation and rejoice in dying for the Truth."*

The Protestants were just as cruel and superstitious as the Catholics. It is an historical fact that the greatest leaders of the Reformation—Martin Luther and John Calvin—wholeheartedly supported the witchcraft mania. John Calvin actually presided over the execution in Geneva of many victims accused of this "crime."

Hitler, Mussolini, Lenin and Stalin could find in a careful study of the Inqusition and its methods to exterminate "heretics," and the methods of the Jesuits to indoctrinate the young, all they needed to know about secret police, spies, purges, terror, propaganda and "brain-washing"—all indispensable equipment in

**The History of Torture,* Daniel P. Mannix, Dell Publishing Co. Inc., New York, 1964, pp. 44-61.

the contemporary totalitarian state. No wonder religion was equated in most decent European minds with ignorance, superstition, and fanaticism and an obstacle barring all hope of moral and material progress.

Since the Quran categorically declares that faith is a gift from God which He bestows upon whom He chooses and thus cannot be compelled even by persuasion, much less force, and forbids spying and backbiting as among the most serious sins, it is noteworthy that nowhere in the annals of Islamic history in any Muslim land do we find torture and terror institutionalized and officially sanctioned as a major legal weapon in pre-European colonial times.

Here we can most clearly understand how Christendom combined with Jewry is the most implacable enemy of an Islamic revival. Christian missionaries applaud all innovations which are conducive to the disintegration of the Islamic way of life andthe Westernization of the Muslim world. Note how such totalitarian dictatorships, like the Kemalist regime in Turkey, are justified on *Christian* grounds! And this is no concidence since the Christian missionary endeavour has not only sanctioned but actively participated alongside all the other forces destructive to Islam and favourable to Westernization in every Muslim land. Their sinister hands were behind the murder of Ahmadu Bello and Abu Bakr Tawafa Belawa in Nigeria which put an end to Islamic rule in that country and brought in its wake the chaos of endless civil war. The same hands were behind the overthrow of Muslim rule in Zanzibar and the wholesale

massacre and expulsion of the Arabs there. They gave whole-hearted support to the Emperor Haile Selassie's brutal attempt to exterminate the entire Muslim population of Ethiopia even though the Muslims constitute the majority in that country. They applaud every illicit territorial gain of the Zionists in retrieving the Arab world for Western civilization and destroying the Muslim character of Palestine. They make no efforts to restrain their glee over the colonization of Palestine by European Jews and the expulsion of the Arabs, including even the Christian Arabs! And the most unpardonable sin of all is that Christian missionaries refuse to admit any responsibility for these atrocities but attempt merely to explain them away as purely spontaneous, local developments. From the moment the Emperor Constantine decided to institute Christianity as the official religion to unify the decaying Roman Empire until the present, the Church has consistently been the greatest ally of political tyranny, oppression and the forces of corruption.

European Christendom's hostility towards Islam is deeply embedded in its history and classical literature from the early medieval period onwards. Two of the best known works of European literature of that period which have become folklore are the epic poems, THE SONG OF ROLAND and EL-CID both revolving around the struggle of the Christans against the Muslims for Spain and southern France.

The most dramatic episode of this protracted conflict were the Crusades. The following is the

official text of the summons of Pope Eugene III for the second crusade on December 1, 1145 :

How much our predecessors, the Roman pontiffs did labour for the deliverance of the oriental church, we have learned from the accounts of the ancients and have found it written in their acts. For our predecessor of blessed memory, Pope Urban did sound as it were, a celestial trump and did take care to arouse for its deliverance the sons of the holy Roman church from the different parts of the earth. At his voice, indeed, those beyond the mountain and especially the bravest and strongest warriors if the French kingdom of also those of Italy, inflamed by the ardour of love, did come together and congregating a very great army, not without such shedding of their own blood, the divine aid being with them, did free from the filth of the pagans, that city (Jerusalem) where our Saviour willed to suffer for us and where He left His glorious sepulchre to us as a memorial of His passion which by the grace of God and the zeal of your fathers who at intervals of time have striven to the extent of their power to defend them and to spread the name of Christ in those parts have been retained by the Christians up to this day; and other cities of the infidels have by them been manfully conquered. But now a thing we cannot relate without great grief and wailing, the city of Edessa has been taken and many of the castles of the Christians have been occupied by them (the Muslims). The archbishop moreover of this same city together with his clergy and many other Christians have there been slain and the relics of the saints have been trampled under the feet of the infidels and dispersed. Whereby how great a danger threatens the church of God and the whole of Christianity, we both know and do not believe it to be hid from your prudence. For it is known that it will be the greatest proof of nobility and probity if those things which the bravery of

your fathers acquired be defended by you, the sons. But if it should happen otherwise, which God forbid, the valour of the fathers will be found to have diminished in the case of the sons.

We exhort therefore all of you in God; we ask and command and for the remission of sins enjoin; that those who are of God and above all, the greater men and the nobles, do manfully gird themselves; and that you strive so to oppose the multitude of the infidels who rejoice at the time in a victory gained over us, and so to defend the oriental church, that the dignity of the Christian name may increased in your time and that your valour which is praised throughout the whole world, may remain intact and unshaken. We moreover providing with paternal solicitude for your tranquility do grant and confirm by the authority conceded to us of God to those who by the promptings of devotion do decide to undertake and to carry through so holy and so necessary a work that remission of sins which our aforesaid predeccssor, Pope Urban did institute and do decree that their wives and sons and their goods also and possessions shall remain under the protection of ourselves and of the archbishops, bishops and other prelates of the church of God. Those who are opressed with debt and begin so holy a journey with a pure heart shall not pay interest for the time past and if they, or others for them, are bound by an oath or pledge in the matter of interests, we absolve them by apostolic authority. It is allowed to to them also when their relations, being warned or the lords to whose fee they belong, are either unable or unwilling to advance them the money; freely to pledge without any reclamation of their lands or other possessions to churches or to eccesiastical persons or to any other of the faithful. According to the institution of our aforesaid predecessor by the authority of almighty God and that of St. Peter, the chief of apostles conceded to us by God, we grant such remission and absolution of sins that he

> who shall devoutly begin so sacred a journey and shall accomplish it or die during it, shall obtain absolution for all his sins which with a humble and contrite heart he shall confess and shall receive the fruit of eternal reward from the Renumerator of all.*

The results of this exhortation are known to even the most casual students of history. The crusaders formed much more of a wild unruly mob than anything which could be described as an army, including in their ranks some of the most notorious criminals, rabble-rousers and convicts from the prisons. As they surged through Europe at intervals throughout the 11th and 12th centuries, the chief victims were the Jews whom they massacred wholesale without mercy especially in Germany. The solicitude of the Crusaders for the oriental church was demonstrated when instead of uniting all Christendom against the "infidel Turk," they plundered Constantinople in 1204, a blow from which Byzantium never recovered, the motive for this atrocity being that the crusaders from Venice were determined to destroy their principle commercial rival, all of this with the official sanction of the Roman papacy.

It is no historical coincidence that as a reaction against the injustice perpetuated by the Church, the atheism of Karl Marx, was born in Christian Germany and first took root in Christian Russia

*_The Papal Encyclicals in their Historical Context_, edited by Anne Freemantle. The New American Library, New York, 1963, pp. 67-69.

for in Christianity monasticism, secularism, materialism and paganism all join hands.

This compromise with paganism are most clearly revealed by a study of those aspects of Christian theology which conflict most acutely with Islam. To quote the official Baltimore Catholic Catechism, here is *The Apostles' Creed* which is to Christians what our *Kalimah* or profession of faith is to us :

> I believe in God, the Father Almighty, Creator of heaven and earth and in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, died and was buried. He descended into Hell; the third day He arose again from the dead. He ascended into Heaven, sitteth at the right hand of God, the Father Almighty. From thence He shall come to judge the living and the dead. I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Holy Catholic Church, the communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body and life everlasting. Amen.
>
> **Is there only one God ?**
>
> Yes, there is only one God.
>
> **How many persons are there in God ?**
>
> In God there are three divine Persons, the Father, the Son and Holy Ghost. Unaided by divine revelation, the human mind cannot know of the existence of the blessed Trinity because it is a supernatural mystery. Even after God has revealed the existence of the blessed Trinity, we cannot understand it. When we believe on the word of God that there are three Persons in one God, we do not believe that three persons are one person or that three gods are one God, for that would be a contradiction.
>
> **Is the Father God ?**
>
> The Father is God and the first Person of the blessed Trinity. The first Person of the blessed Trinity is called

the Father because from all enternity, He begets the second Person, His only Begotten Son. God, the Father is called the first Person, not because He is greater than the other two Persons but because He is unbegotten.

**Is the Son God?**

The Son is God and the second Person of the blessed Trinity. The second Person of the blessed Trinity is called the Son because from all eternity, He is the only begotten of the Father. Proceeding from the Father, the Son is called the Divine Word or the wisdom of the Father.

**Is the Holy Ghost God?**

The Holy Gost is God and the third Person of the blessed Trinity. The third Person of the blessed Trinity is called the Holy Ghost because from all eternity He is breathed forth, as it were, by the Father and the Son. Proceeding from the Father and the Son, He is called the Gift of Love of the Father and the Son. The word "Ghost" means "Spirit."

**What do we mean by the Blessed Trinity?**

By the blessed Trinity we mean one and the same God in three divine Persons.

**Are the three divine Persons really distinct from one another ?**

The three divine Persons are entirely distinct from one another. Although the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost are distinct Persons, they are not distinct in nature. The nature of the Father is entirely the nature of the Son and the nature of the Father and the Son is entirely the nature of the Holy Ghost.

**Are the three divine Persons perfectly equal to one another?**

The three divine Persons are perfectly equal to one another because all are one and the same God. No one of the

three Persons precedes the others in time or in power but all are equally eternal and all-powerful because they have the same divine nature.

**How are the three divine Persons, though really distinct from one another, one and the same God?**

Because the three divine Persons have one and the same Divine nature, they have the same perfections and the same external works are produced by them. But in order that we may better know the three divine Persons, for example, omnipotence and the works of omnipotence such as creation are ascribed to the Father; wisdom and the works of wisdom such as enlightenment to the Son; love and the works of love, such as sanctification to the Holy Ghost.

**Can we fully understand how the three divine Persons, though entirely distinct from one another, are one and the same God?**

We cannot fully understand because this is a supernatural mystery. A supernatural mystery is a truth which we cannot fully understand but which we firmly believe because we have God's word for it. In Heaven, there will be a fuller understanding of these mysteries but never an infinite comprehension of them.*

Here is how a Christian missionary attempts to make this incomprehensible theology palatable to the Muslim mind :

It is important to make clear that the Christian doctrine of God is not intricate for intricacy's sake or that the issues implicit in its formulation are artificial and unnecessary. It is also important to consider that the criterion of simplicity here is not assumed. "Simple solutions," A. N. Whitehead once declared, "are bogus solutions." Be that as it may, the

***Understanding the Catholic Faith*, John A. O'Brien, Ave Maria Press, Notre Dame, Indiana, 1954, pp. 65-67.

higher the theme, the less likelihood there is that it can be adequately formulated in simple terms. We insist that doctrines of God are not properly to be evaluated by the criterion of simplicity. The Trinity is a way of understanding God's unity. For the Muslim, faith in God, as Father, Son and Holy Spirit does violence to the Divine Unity. For the Christian, it expresses and illuminates that Unity. The Muslim sees the doctrine of the Trinity as incompatible with belief in the unity of God. The Christian finds these not merely compatible but interdependent. The issue Christianity understands is not Trinity and Unity but Trinity and atheism. We are not discussing monotheism and polytheism. Muslims who debate polytheism are not discussing Christianity. Where we differ is how to define and understand the Divine Unity. What lies outside that issue is irrelevant to Christianity. (pp. 306-308). There is absolutely no reason to insist, as some Muslim do, that the term "Father" necessarily implies paternity in the physical sense. It goes without saying that God does not have children as His creatures do. This, however, does not invalidate the use of the deepest analogy known to human life, the more so since all fatherhood and family is the idea of God and takes its name, according to St. Paul, from Him.

Is the doctrine of the Trinity against reason? It may transcend our complete rational comprehension and also elude philosophical discovery. But it is certainly open to the fullest exploration the mind can reach. If mystery remains beyond the thinker's reach, this is not to say his ambitions have no place. The theist has no need to be ashamed of the intellectual bearing of his faith. It illuminates many of the otherwise unanswered questions of philosophy. Moreover, it is well to remember that rejection of this doctrine on grounds of mystery does not rid the unbeliever of the mysterious. The Christian doctrine lies precisely where the supreme mysteries belong. Reflection makes it clear that the idea of the Divine Unity cannot be enforced in a mathe-

> matical sense, and that enforcements in such a context is the ground of most Muslim antipathy to the Christian Trinity. The higher we proceed in the scale of being, the more rich and varied are the unities we encounter. Mathematical units are low in the scale of values such as stones or a unicellular organism. Human personalities are the richest and most diversified unities within our experience. William Shakespeare and Abraham Lincoln were single persons but what a wealth of diversity lay within them! If the order of ascending unity reveals increasing richness, who shall say that the Unity of God is not the richest and greatest of all? Certainly, we cannot disallow the doctrine of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit on the ground that these add up to three. Was not Muhammad a Prophet, a leader and an example? He was no less than one Muhammad. (pp. 316-317)*

Christian leaders vehemently assert that the doctrine of Trinity in no way violates the concept of monotheism but, as Dr. Cragg argues, is indispensable to it! But it must be remembered that **Islam does not only prohibit the evil of polytheism itself but all the roads that lead to it.** Hindu philosophers will also argue that their concept of God is not contrary to monotheism. The Hindus also, have their Trinity—*Brahman*, the Creator, *Vishnu*, the Preserver and *Shiva*, the Destroyer. Sophisticated Hindus assert that their millions of lesser gods are only various aspects and manifestations of the One true God. What a rich variety of idols can be found in any Hindu temple, all manifestations of the unity Dr. Cragg would certainly applaud! The pagan Arabs of Mecca were also sophisticated enough to adopt this same fallacy.

**The Call of the Minaret*, Kenneth Cragg, op. cit.

When the Holy Prophet began to preach the doctrine of pure and uncompromising monotheism, the Quraish in Mecca assured him that they accepted Allah as the chief of the gods and that their acceptance of all the other gods did not constitute polytheism but merely the varied manifestations of one and the same God. This the Holy Prophet vehemently rejected and *Tauhid* or pure and unadulterated monotheism is the most essential of all Islamic teachings from which our entire way of life is derived.

The Christian anthropomorphization of their concept of God is expressed in the crudest materialistic manner in the last chapter of the New Testament, the *Revelation of St. John, the Divine* :

> After this I looked and behold, a door was opened in heaven and the first voice which I heard was as it were of a trumpet talking with me which said: Come up hither and I will show the things which must be Hereafter. And immediately I was in the spirit and behold, a Throne was set in heaven and One (God) sat on the Throne. And He (God) Who sat there looked like a jasper and a sardine stone; and there was a rainbow round the Throne in sight like unto an emerald. And round the throne were four and twenty seats and upon the seats I saw four and twenty elders sitting, clothed in white rainment and they had on their heads crowns of gold. And out of the Throne proceeding lightnings and thunderings and voices and there were seven lamps of fire burning before the throne which are the seven Spirits of God. And before the Throne there was a sea of glass like unto crystal; and in the midst of the Throne and round about the Throne, were four beasts full of eyes before and behind. And the first beast was like a lion, and the second beast like a calf. and the third beast had a face as a man and

> the fourth beast was like a flying eagle. And the four beasts had each of them six wings about him and they were full of eyes within and they rest not day and night, saying Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty which was and is to come. And when these beasts give glory and honour and thanks to Him that sat on the Throne who liveth forever and ever, the four and twenty elders fall down before Him that sat on the Throne and worship Him that liveth forever and ever and cast their crowns before the Throne saying, Thou art worthy O Lord to receive glory and honour and power; for Thou hast created all things and for Thy pleasure they are and were created. **Revelation : 4.**

Now contrast this with the sublime description of God in the Holy Quran :

> Allah! There is no God save Him, the Alive, the Eternal. Neither slumber nor sleep overtaketh Him. Unto Him belongeth whatsoever is in the heavens and whatsoever is in the earth. Who is he that intercedeth with Him save by His permission? He knoweth that which is in front of them (the future) and that which is behind them (the past) while they encompass nothing of His knowledge save what He will. His throne includeth the heavens and the earth and He is never weary of preserving them. He is the Sublime, the Tremendous. (11-255)

The doctrine of the Trinity has certainly led many Christians, especially among the simple and illiterate poor, straight to polytheism. This corruption from monotheism to polytheism is most glaringly illustrated in the saint-worship of the Roman Catholic Church.

> A saint in the strict sense of the word is a person who is declared officially by the Church to be in Heaven and who may be publicly venerated. The veneration paid to the saints in Heaven differs essentially from the adoration of God. The saints are creatures and not to be given the supreme worship

due to the Creator alone. The supreme honour must be given only to God in the full and strict sense of the word. The veneration given to the Blessed Mother and to the saints is an act of respect and honour of an entirely different nature. The veneration given to the Blessed Mother of God (the virgin Mary) surpasses that given to the saints and angels.

**Why do we honour the saints in Heaven?**

We honour the saints in Heaven because they practiced great virtue when they were on earth and because in honoring those who are the chosen friends of God, we honour God himself.

**How can we honour the saints?**

We can honour the saints first by imitating their holy lives, second by praying to them, and third, bv showing respect to their relics and images. When we pray to the saints, we ask them to offer their prayers to God for us.

**Why do we honour relics?**

We honour relics because they are the bodies of the saints or objects connected with the saints or with our Lord. The honour given to a relic does not stop at the sacred object itself, but is directed to the person whose relic is venerated.

**Is it right to show respect to the statues and pictures of Christ and of the saints?**

It is right to show respect to the statues and pictures of Christ and of the saints just as it is right to show respect to the images of those whom we honour and love on earth. Making or use of pictures and statues is forbidden only when they promote false worship.

**Do we honour Christ and the saints when we pray before the Crucifix, relics and sacred images?**

We honour Christ and the saints when we pray before the Crucifix, relics and sacred images because we honour the persons they represent. We adore Christ, and venerate

the saints. We place our trust in God and the intercessory power of the saints.*

The result of these teachings is that the unsophisticated simple folk of the Roman Catholic countries, and even many of the more educated, are much more preoccupied with praying to the saints than praying to God. With the multitude of saints in the Roman Catholic Church, God is obscured and almost forgotten!

When I came to Mexico, I had no idea that I was going to become so intimately involved with the Saints. I had always known that there were saints. I longed passionately for Joan of Arc to be canonized. I realized that a lot of my future happiness would depend on St. Peter. But I didn't know that the saints, hosts of them, were going to be in and out of my life like neighbors. Some of them came to be as close as friends who phoned daily; others were to be turned to in time of tribulation and some became trusted confidants who never let me down. I loved them through thick and thin, though often they were capricious and childish with me, refusing me the simplest favours.

I took up with San Antonio (St. Anthony) in a hasty, opportunistic way. I confess he never held it against me. It is a relationship that has deepened with the years. I ring him up, via urgent ejaculations and sudden prayers, several times a day, and I believe I may say that we are devoted friends, Many are the miracles he has performed for me as proof of his power and his kindness.

We met in the following manner. I had been home to visit my mother in California and had taken a bus to Los Angeles where I was to board a train for Mexico. But on arrival to Los Angeles, I learned that the bus company had lost my luggage somewhere on route. Now I had jewelry,

**Understanding the Catholic Faith*, op. cit., pp. 150-152.

presents and other treasures in the suitcase besides my clothes. I was distressed. But when I told this sad tale to a friend, she said to me, "Have you tried San Antonio? He is the patron of lost objects."

"No, tell me what to do," I implored.

"You must take an exercise in humility, do an act of contrition for your sins and say a *novena*—that is, a prayer for nine consecutive days. Then if there is no reason why you should not have your luggage back, San Antonio will give it to you."

I faithfully performed the rites and I am here to remark that when I got home, I found a letter from my mother. In it she said, "An odd thing happened. A few minutes ago the bus company drove up and delivered your lost suitcase. I checked rightaway and everything was in it. It had been to Alaska and back. To make certain, I myself will bring it to you."

Thus San Antonio, bless and love him, got me back my suitcase and brought my mother for a visit as well. And many are the lost objects he has found for me, from my passport to a silver thimble. In fact, he so overwhelms me with his favours that I am shamed and will not often ask for myself but every time I ask with a full heart for something for anyone I love, San Antonio's generosity is immediately forthcoming.*

I myself have had experience with the same saint. Once when I was ten years old, I lost one of my school books and ran to my teacher to tell her of my plight. My teacher, who happened to be a Roman Catholic, advised me to make a *novena* and pray to St. Anthony who would then surely retrieve it for me!

Manufacturing images of Catholic saints is a big business in America. When I was eighteen years

**My Heart Lies South*; *The Story of My Mexican Marriage*, Elizabeth Borton de Trevino, op. cit., pp. 236-240.

old, I worked for a summer in a factory which manufactured crucifixes by mass-production. All July and August of 1952, in order to earn enough money to buy my clothes for college, I stood at a machine which turned out several hundred crucifixes an hour. I filled many huge crates with plastic images of Jesus dying on the Cross which my fellow-workers sitting at tables nearby would coat with gold or silver leaf and glue the images to the crosses which came in assorted colours and sizes. When completed, the crucifixes would be sold for the equivalent of a rupee or two at the local stores. The profits on the sale which poured into pockets of the owner of the factory where I worked, must have been considerable. Once when my father was out of work, the only job he could find was for a local factory in the same community which specialized in manufacturing images of every Roman Catholic saint from tiny statues in plastic or ivory two or three inches long to life-sized ones of marble or wood five and six feet high, some of which could be illuminated by electricity at night. The illustrated catalogue published by this prosperous company was most impressive—hundreds of images to be prayed to by millions of credulous worshippers. In the suburban community in New York where I lived, it was a common practice among the Roman Catholics to hang a little plastic statue of St. Christopher about four inches high in the front window of their luxurious cars in order to insure them protection against accidents. Is this not idolatry? How can that kind of polytheism sanctioned and encouraged in the Roman Catholic Church be differentiated from

paganism?

*Shirk* (associating partners with God) is characteristic of all Christian prayers and worship. Here is a sample from some of the most commonly used prayers of the Roman Catholic Church:

**The Lord's Prayer:** (This prayer is used among Protestants as well.)

Our *Father,* Who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth as it is in Heaven. Give us this day our daily bread and forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us, and lead us not into temptation but deliver us from evil for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory. Amen.

**The Hail Mary**

Hail Mary, full of grace. The Lord is with thee. Blessed art thou among women and blessed is the fruit of thy womb, Jesus. Holy Mary, *Mother of God,* pray for us sinners now and at the hour of our death. Amen.

**Hail Holy Queen**

Hail Holy Queen, Mother of Mercy our life, our sweetness and our hope ! To thee do we cry, poor banished children of Eve. To thee do we send up our sighs, mourning and weeping in this vale of tears ! Turn then, most gracious Advocate, thine eyes of mercy towards us and after this, our exile, show unto us the blessed fruit of thy womb, Jesus. O clement, O loving, sweet Virgin Mary !

**Memorare**

Remember, O most gracious Virgin Mary, that never was it known that anyone who fled to thy protection, implored thy help and sought thy intercession was left unaided. Inspired by this confidence, I fly to thee, O Virgin of virgins, *my mother* ! To thee I come. Before thee

I stand, sinful and sorrowful. O *Mother of the Word Jncarnate*, despise not my petitions but in thy mercy, hear and answer me ! Amen.

**Glory be to the Father**

Glory be to the Father and the Son and to the Holy Ghost as it was in the beginning, is now and ever shall be, world without end. Amen.

**Act of Hope**

O my God, relying on Thy infinite goodness and promises, I hope to obtain pardon for my sins, the help of Thy grace and life everlasting *through the merits of Jesus Christ, my Lord and Redeemer.* Amen.

And here are some Protestant prayers as taken from their hymns, all of which have been composed by English poets and musicians :

I think when I read that sweet story of old
When Jesus was here among men,
How he called little children as lambs to His fold.
I should like to have been with Him then . . . .
Jesus, tender Shephard, hear me ;
Bless thy little lamb tonight ;
Through the darkness be thou near me ;
Keep me safe till morning light.
All this day Thy hand has led me
And I thank thee for Thy care ;
Thou hast clothed me, warmed and fed me ;
Listen to my evening prayer ! . . . .
For food and rest and loving care
And all that makes the world so fair
We thank Thee, Lord . . . .
How strong and sweet my Father's care
That round me like the air
Is with me always everywhere.
He cares for me . . . .
Praise God from all blessings flow.

Praise Him all creatures here below.
Praise Him above ye heavenly host.
*Praise Father, Son and Holy Ghost ....*
Holy, holy, holy ! Lord God Almighty !
Early in the morning your song shall rise to Thee,
Only Thou art holy. There is none beside Thee,
Perfect in love, faith and purity ....
Onward Christian solidiers
Marching as to war
*With the Cross of Jesus*
Going on before !

So unlike the throughly man-made composition of Christian worship, Islamic supplications are all from Holy Quran and Hadith and are thus direct from God as revealed to the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings of God be upod him). For this reason there is no compromise with the strictest and purest montheism. The virile language of the *Salat* is a sharp contrast to the mawkish sentimentality so characteristic of Christian worship,

In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful :
Praise be unto Allah, the Lord of Universe,
Most merciful, most compassionate.
Master of the Day of Judgement.
Thee alone do we serve and of Thee we beg for help,
Show us the straight path,
The path of those whom Thou hast favoured.
Not those whose portion is wrath and who go astray ....
In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful.
Say He, Allah is One.
Allah upon Whom all depend.
He begets not nor is He begotten
And there is none comparable to Him ....
Surely I have turned myself being upright wholly to Him Who orginated the heavens and the earth and I am

not of the polytheists. Surely my prayer and my sacrifice, my life and my death belong to Allah, the Lord of the Worlds. No associate has He and this I am commanded and I am one of those who submit....

(O Allah!) Give us the good of this world and the good of the Hereafter and save us from the doom of Hell-fire!....

O Allah! Thou art the Author of peace and from Thee comes peace. O our Creator and Cherisher, keep us alive with peace and let us enter the Home of Peace (Paradise). O Lord, possessor of glory and honour!

Here is how the Christian missionary attacks the Islamic conception of God as represented by the English poet, Alfred Austin who wrote at the turn of the century:

Now vesper brings the sunset hour,
Where the crusading knight once trod,
Muezzin from his minaret tower
Proclaims, 'There is no God but God!'
*Male God who shares His godhead with*
*No virgin's mother's sacred tear,*
But finds on earth congenial with
Weddings of the sword and spear!

There can be no doubt that the encouragement of picture and statute-making by the Christian church has been responsible more than any other factor for the corruption of monotheism into what is tantamount to polytheism. Yet the Chrittian missionary dares attack the Islamic ban on picture and statue-making with the following curious arguments:

Many are the examples of calligraphy for the non Arab visitor who finds himself in a house of Muslim prayer.

*Quoted from *Childhood in the Moslem World*, Zwemer, op. cit., p. 202,

Whether it is in Cairo, Istanbul or Lahore, he will be at once fascinated and perplexed by the long "rivers" of Quranic script that adorn the walls and domes and minarets. Letters and words superimposed upon each other defeat his desire to disentangle and translate them. But they express in the most characteristic from the devotion and dogma of Islam. Words without pictures—such is the uncompromising law of Islam in the mosque. The central affirmation of Muslim dogma—*Tauhid* or Unity—lays its firm veto on representational art. The image, the ikon, the statue, the painting—these are banished. The new faith from Arabia was passionately iconoclastic. Expanding into lands with a rich Christian heritage of pictorial art and splendid iconography, Islam dismissed the whole as a dangerous temptation and rejected it contemptuously as a menace to its own mission. If photography has to be admitted, then why not painting and the other arts? After the manner of the bewildered or the dubious, conservatives steer a rear-guard action. When, in 1955, statues in New York of great legislators of history were being repaired and it was found that one represented Muhammad, strong Muslim pressure dissuaded the authorities from re-erecting it. There have been similar incidents in which, for example, encyclopedias have been precluded by Muslim intervention from illustrating any of their articles on Islam. But these instances should be seen as substantiating by contrast a much stronger current running the other way. It is insisted by modernists increasingly in many quarters that artists and the arts should be liberated from theological vetoes and that creative painting should not be tarred with the brush of *Shirk*. Even supposing, as the argument runs, the prohibitions in the Quran and Hadith are valid as they have always been interpreted, times obviously change: they change indeed because of the very success of Islam. A society like that in the Hijaz in the Prophet's day, was so prone to idolary that only the most ruthless prohibitions would suffice. It would, however, be folly to treat a Muslim society today after

centuries of Isiamic *Tauhid* with the same stupid severity. Such a policy would be equivalent to saying that Islam had failed and that no Muslim could be trusted not to take a picture for an idol. A ban, once necessary, can surely be safely lifted. To dispute it would seem to disqualify Islam itself. If anti-idolatry is the most magnificent thing about Islam, the limited sense in which idolatry is taken is most unsatisfying. Are the worst idols material at all? Can anti-idolatry properly be equipped merely with hammers ond brooms? Now that time and change are helping Muslims to break loose from the idea that the idol is an image: that *Shirk* has to do with craftsmen; that the danger lies with things, may it not become plain to Muslims that there is and can be no veto on idolatry? Idolatry can be inwardly forsaken but it cannot be outwardly forbidden. Men will invent idols of the state, of the market-place, of the nation, of their own perversity whether or not artists paint amd chisellers carve. There is a deep likeness between what happens in a great work of art and what the Christian faith believes God is doing in Christ. May not the true meaning of the Trinity be more truly comprehended by the likeness to a true work of art. The tangible and the visible are the home and residence of the spiritual and eternal. Can we not see the Incarnation in these terms as the self-revelation of God dwelling in the fashion of the living and crucified Christ? Is not this what the Gospel means when it proclaims that "the Word became flesh?" The Muslim fear of idolatry is always sound but the security against it is not in banning the artists any more than God's unity is safeguarded by vetoing the Incarnation of God in Christ. It is a true recognition of Him in undivided love. That love may include unashamedly the help and benediction of the senses and the arts.*

**The Dome and the Rock : Jersualem Studies in Islam,* Kenneth Cragg, op. cit., pp. 125-135.

The question here is not theoretical but practical. True, it is possible for idolatry to exist without tangible idols, but while the ban on representative art may not by itself ensure a pure and unadulterated monotheism, the manufacture of pictures and statues certainly sanctions, encourages and increases the evil to gigantic proportions. The mere passage of time does not render such an injunction obsolete because human nature in every generation, regardless of technical and scientific progress, is unchanged and always subject to the same temptations. In the arts encouraged by the Christian Church, paganism and atheism join hands.

The great beauty of so many religious works of art only serves to aggregate the harm they do. Believe it or not, when I was a child, I really thought God was an old man with a long, white beard! All the famous religious paintings by medieval European artists I had seen in the *Metropolitan Museum* in New York convinced me that this was true. Every time I thought of God, I saw in my mind Michalangelo's "Creation" scene on the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel in Rome. During adolescence as I matured intellectually, the concept of God as old man with long white beard, depicted in every religious painting I ever saw, began to seem so ridiculous that I rejected belief in God altogether. I am sure that many other young people growing up in the West have experienced the same as I did.

Perhaps the most important intellectual factor which prevented Europe's religious regeneration was the current conception of Jesus Christ as the Son of God. Philosophically-minded Christians, of course, never took this idea of sonship in its literal sense; they understood it as a manifesta-

tion of God's mercy in human form. But, unfortunately, not everyone has a philosophical mind. For the overwhelming majority of Christians, the expression "son" had and has a very direct meaning, although there was always a mystical flavour attached to it. For them, Christ's sonship of God quite naturally led to an *anthropomorphisation* of God Himself, who assumed the shape of a bengin old man with white flowing beard, and this shape, perpetuated by innumerable paintings of high artistic value, remained impressed upon the European's subconscious mind. During the time when the dogma of the Church reigned supreme in Europe, there was not much inclination to question this strange conception. But once the intellectual shackles of the Middle Ages were broken the thoughtful among the Europeans could not reconcile themselves to a humanised God-Father; on the other hand, this anthropomorphisation had become a standing factor in the popular conception of God. After a period of enlightenment, European thinkers instinctively shrank back from the conception of God as presented by the teachings of the Church and, as this was the only conception they knew, they began to reject the very idea of God altogether and, with it, of every religion.*

Next to the doctrine of the Trinity, one of the most acute theological conflicts between Christianity and Islam is concerning the nature of sin. In the Holy Quran, God reveals to us that He not only forgave Adam and Eve for their sin but raised Adam to the status of a genuine Prophet. In the Bible, however, God does not forgive Adam and Eve and this is the basis for the dogma that every men is *born* in sin and can only be forgiven by God through baptism into the Christian faith!

**Islam at the Crossroads*, Muhammad Asad (formerly Leopold Weiss), Arafat Publications, Lahore, 1963, pp. 51-52.

**What commandment did God give Adam and Eve ?**

God gave Adam and Eve the commandment not to eat the fruit of a certain tree that grew in the Garden of Paradise.

"And He commanded him (Adam), saying: Of every tree of Paradise thou shalt eat but the tree of knowiedge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat. For whosoever shalt eat of it thou shalt be doomed.... (Genesis 2 : 16-17)

**What happened to Adam and Eve on account of their sin?**

On account of their sin, Adam and Eve lost sanctifying grace, the right of Heaven and their special gifts: they became subject to death, to suffering and to a strong inclination to evil and they were driven from the garden of Paradise.

**What has happened to us on account of the sin of Adam?**

On account of the sin of Adam, we, his descendants, come into the world deprived of sanctifying grace and inherit his punishment as we would have inherited his gifts had he been obedient to God.

**What is this sin called ?**

This sin in us is called *Original Sin.*

**Why is this sin called original ?**

This sin is called original because it comes down to us through our origin or descent from Adam.*

The dogma of Original Sin where human nature is conceived as innately evil, is accepted by Protestants as much as by Catholics. Now compare the Biblical story of Adam and Eve with the Quranic version :

And verily We made a convenant of old with Adam but he forgot and We found no constancy in him. And when We said unto the angels; Fall prostrate before Adam, all fell prostrate save Iblis who refused. Therefore We said :

**Understanding the Catholic Faith*, op. cit,, pp. 74-475.

> Oh Adam! This is an enemy unto thee and unto thy wife so let him not drive you both out of the Garden lest thou come to toil..And the Devil whispereth to him saying; Oh Adam! Shall I show thee the tree of immortality and power that wasteth not away? Then they twain ate thereof so that their shame became apparent unto them and they began to hide by heaping on themselves some of the leaves of the Garden. And Adam disobeyed his Lord, so went astray. **Then his Lord chose him and relented toward him and guided him.** He said: Go down hence both of you; one of you a foe unto the other. But if there come unto you from Me a guidance, then whoso followeth My guidance, he will not go astray nor come to grief. (XX ; 115-123).

Thus it can be seen that the Christian doctrine of Original Sin has no place in Islam. Islam teaches that every baby is born with a pure and innocent nature; only after puberty is he corrupted if he falls prey to the temptations of Satan and becomes so involved in this worldly life tnat he forgets the Hereafter.

> Surely We created man in the best of stature. Then We reduced him to the lowest of the low save those who believe and do good works and this is a reward unfailing.
>
> (XCV : 4-6)

The Islamic concept of the nature of sin and evil differs very sharply from Judaism and Christianity. Man commits sin because, in contrast to the animals and the angels, he has been endowed by God with *Free Will*. If man did not posses the freedom to commit sin, virtue would be meaningless. The nobility of human character comes from successfully resisting temptations to commit evil. Islam teaches that this life is an *examination* for the Hereafter. Those who submit themselves to the Divine Law of Allah as revealed in Quran and Hadith and subordinate the

considerations of this world in order to attain salvation in the Hereafter, have achieved the ultimate success while those who deny God as their Sovereign or revere oth er powers instead of God and reject Divine Law for their own man-made laws and feel that they possess the independence and right to do as they please as expediency dictates, will be condemmed by God on Judgment Day as guilty of *Kufr* and be doomed forever. Thus man has been given the freedom by God to commit evil as well as to do good because the examination would have no meaning unless is there is as strong possibility of failure as for success. Islam teaches that a man or woman becomes fully responsible for his or her actions only *after puberty*. Therefore those individuals who die in infancy or childhood, regardless of the faith of their parents, will, without exception, be made happy in Paradise. A man cannot be held responsible by God for any wrong-doing committed during the unconsciousness of sleep, delerium or insanity. Islam teaches that the infant, the feeble-minded and the insane will receive no punisment in the Hereafter. In order to be held responsible for one's actions, a man must possess his full mental faculties. Contrast this with what Christianisy has to teach on the subject:

> **What is Baptism ?**
>
> Baptism is the sacrament that gives our souls the new life of sanctifying grace by which we become children of God and heirs of heaven.
>
> **What sin does Baptism take away ?**
>
> Baptism takes away Original Sin and also actual sins and all the punishment due to them if the person baptized be guilty of any actual sins and truly sorry for them:

**Who can administer Baptism ?**

The priest is the usual minister of Baptism but if there is danger that someone will die without Baptism, anyone else may and should baptize.

**How would you give Baptism ?**

I would give Baptism by pouring ordinary water on the forehead of the person to be baptized saying, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." In solemn baptism, baptismal water from the Church blessed by the priest for the purpose must be used under penalty of grave sin.

**Why is Baptism necessary for the salvation of all men ?**

Baptism is necessary for the salvation of all men because Christ has said; "Unless a man be born again of water and the Spirit of Me, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."

**When should children be baptized ?**

Children should be baptized as soon as possible after *birth* because baptism is necessary for salvation. *Infants who die without baptism of any kind do not suffer the punishments of those who die in mortal sin. They may enjoy a certain natural happiness but they cannot enjoy the supernatural happiness of Heaven.*

**What sin do Catholic parents commit who put off for a long time or entirely neglect the baptism of their children ?**
They commit a mortal sin.

In his *Confessions*, St. Augustine laments the "sinfulness" of his infancy :

Hear O God ! Alas for man's sin ! So saith man and Thou pitiest him for thou madest him and sin in him Thou madest not. Who remindeth me of the sin of my infancy ? **For in Thy sight none is pure from sin, even the infant whose life is but a day upon this earth.** Was

* *Understanding the Catholic Faith.* op. cit., pp. 194-199.

it that I hung upon the breast and cried ? For should I now do so for food suitable to my age, justly should I be laughed at and reproved. What I then did was worthy of reproof but since I could not understand reproof, custom and reason forbade me to be reproved. For those habits when grown we root out and cast away. Was it good to bitterly resent that its own elders, the very authors of its birth, served it not ? That many besides wiser than it obeyed not its demands ? To do its best to strike and hurt because its whims were not obeyed which had they been obeyed, would have been to its harm ? The weakness of infant limbs, not its will, is its innocence. Myself have seen and known even a baby envious. It could not speak, yet it turned pale and looked bitterly on its foster-brother. Who knows not this ? Mothers and nurses tell you that they allay these things by I know not what remedies. Is that too innocence when the fountain of milk is flowing in rich abundance not to endure one to share it though in extremest need and whose very life depends thereon ? We bear gently with all this not as being slight evils because they will disappear as the years increase, for though tolerated now, the very same tempers are utterly intolerable when found in riper years. But if I was born in iniquity and in sin did my mother conceive me, where I beseech thee, O my God, where Lord or when was I, Thy servant guiltless ?*

Islam teaches that if one is truly sorry for one's sins, resolves to do one's best to overcome evil temptations and begs God for forgiveness any time of the day or night, God will almost certainly grant him pardon, particularly for sins committed in ignorance. Christianity teaches that this forgiveness from God is not possible without implicit faith in Jesus Christ as His only begotten Son and the Redeemer of the sins of all

*_Confessions of_ St _Augustine_, J. M. Dent and Sons, London, 1947, pp. 7-8.

mankind. To this dogma, John Calvin, one of the most important leaders of the Protestánt reformation, added the doctrine of predestination. This led to the Calvinist obsession with sin to a point which is definitely morbid. As a Calvinist minister, Reverend T. Stebbing, stated; "The Christian God knew before He created man that he would sin and so He condemined the human race to Hell and endless suffering." What dreadful demon could rival such a Creator? John Calvin pretended that he could hear unborn babes in the wombs of their mothers crying, "Oh why hast thou sinned, oh Adam?" The dogma of Original Sin and the Calvinist doctrine of predestination, instead of bringing hope and joy to Christians, filled their minds with sorrow and gloom:

"Let us examine Reverend Michael Wigglesworth's '*The Day of Doom*'* where he spares no ultimate cruelty in his sulphurous picture of the hatefulness of an angry God :

For at midnight breaks forth a light which turns the night to day.
And speedily in hideous cry doth all the world dismay,
Sinners awake, their hearts to ache, trembling their loins surpriseth ;
Amazed with fear by what they hear, each one of them ariseth.
They rush from their beds with giddy heads and to the windows run.
Viewing the light which shines more bright than doth the noon-day sun.

*This book, printed in New England in the 17th century, was very popular with the early Puritan settlers. In fact, it was the first American best-seller, thousands of copies sold and distributed within a few years.

Straightway appears they see with tears the Son of God
most dread,

Who with his train comes on amain to judge the quick
and the Dead.

Before His face the heavens give place, the skies are rent
asunder.

With mighty voice and hideous noise more terrible than
the thunder,

His brightness damps heavens' glorious lamps and makes
them hide their heads,

As if afraid and quite dismayed, they quit their wonted
steads.

"And as soon as the Trumpet is sounded, the dead rise from the graves, the living are hunted out of their hiding places and dragged shrieking before the awful Throne. Then the tremendous court scene is described vividly and unflinchingly. The sheep are separated from the goats and after a brief explanation of the dogma of election and grace, the Lord seats the elect on thrones to help Him judge the others. Here is where the author gets in all his exposition of Calvinist doctrine when every group pleads its case before the Lord refutes each and condemns it to the infernal concourse.

"And at last appears the most pitiful crowd of all —the babes who had died in infancy and who were reprobates solely by the doctrine of Original Sin. They plead:

If for our own transgression or disobedience
We did stand at thy left hand, just were the recompense,
But Adam's guilt our souls hath spilt;
His fault is charged upon us.
That alone hath overthrown and utterly undone us.

"And there sits Adam on his throne, one of the elect, while the babes point to him and say, 'Not we, but he ate of the tree.' The Lord thereupon explains to them patiently this knotty point of Christian creed; yet when He comes to pronounce sentence, He suddenly and surprisingly relents a little—but just a little—for He concludes:

> Therefore in bliss you may not hope to dwell.
>
> But unto you I shall allow the easiest room in Hell!

Then the Fire is lighted, the sulphurous fumes ascend and the doomed are dragged away to the Pit, the great multitudes of them. The Judge grows impatient:

> But get away without delay,
>
> Christ pities not your cries.
>
> Depart to Hell where you may yell and roar enternally!

"*The Practice of Piety*, a masterpiece of Lewis Bayly, Bishop of Bangor, is an extraordinary book. Let us take some quotations from the second chapter, entitled 'Meditations on the Misery of a Man not Reconciled to God.' Oh wreched man!' it begins, 'Where shall I begin to describe thine endless misery who art condemned as soon as conceived and doomed to eternal Death before thou wast born to a temporal life?' Follows a concise and lurid exposition of Original Sin and the subsequent fate of the sinner. He invites us 'to take a view of the miseries which accompany thy body according to 'the four stages of thy life' and he begins with infancy:

> What wast thou, being an infant but a brute having the shape of man? Was not thy body conceived in the heat of

lust, the seed of shame and the stain of Original Sin ? And thus wast thou not cast naked upon the earth, all covered with the blood of filthiness so that thy mother was ashamed to let thee know the manner thereof? What cause then hast thou to boast of thy birth which was a cursed pain to thy mother and to thyself the entrance into a troublesome life?

"But the infant reprobate survives and reaches youth though 'what is youth but an untamed beast, all of whose actions are rash and rude, not capable of good counsel and delighting in nothing but toys?' This passage ends with the declaration that the youth, in a servile bondage to his elders, is not worthy of description and passes on to manhood:

What is man's estate but a sea whether, like waves, one trouble ariseth on the neck of another, the latter worse than the former ? Now adversity on the left hand frets thee ; anon prosperity on the right hand flatters thee ; over thy head God's vengeance due to thy sin is ready to fall upon thee and under thy feet Hell's mouth is ready to swallow thee up. And in this miserable estate where wilt thou go for rest and comfort? The house is full of cares, the fields of toil, the country of rudeness, the city of factions, the court of envy, the church of sects, the sea of pirates and the land of robbers.

"After such a dizzying volley of denunciations, he comes to old age. This meditation is worth quoting entirely :

What is old age but the receptacle of all maladies ? For if it be thy lot to draw thy days to a long date, comes old-headed age, stooping under dotage, with his wrinkled face, rotten teeth and stinking breath, testy of choler, dimmed with blindness, withered with dryness, absurded with deafness, overwhelmed with sickness and bowed down altogether with weakness having no use of any sense but

the sense of pain which so wracketh every member of his body that it never easeth him of grief till he is thrown down into his grave.

"But the miseries of his old age are but a foretaste of what is in store for the sinner now he must die:

After that, the old man has been afflicted with long sickness and having endured the brunt of pain, should expect some case. In comes Death, nature's slaughterman, God's curse and Hell's purveyor and look the old man grim and black in the face. And as thinking that the old man will not die fast enough, Lord, how many darts of calamities are shot through him—stitches, aches, cramps, fevers, obstructions, rheums, flegmes, collic, stone, wind? And oh, what ghastly sight it is to see him in his bed when Death has given him his mortal wound !

"After the long drawn-out agony, the soul is dragged off to the bottomless lake burning endlessly with fire and brimstone while the 'loathesome carcase is laid in the grave.' And finally we come to a picturesque description of the infernal goal of the reprobate:

Into the bottomless Lake after thou art once plunged, thou shalt be ever failling down and never meet a bottom. Thou shall aways weep for pain of the Fire and yet gnash thy teeth for the extremity of cold. There thy lascivious eyes shall be afflicted with sight of ghastly spirits; thy curious ears shall be affrighted with the hideous noise of howling devils and the gnashing teeth of dammed reprobates ; thy dainty nose shall be cloyed with the stench of of sulphur; thy delicate taste shall be tormented with intolerable hunger and thy drunken throat shall be parched with unquenchable thirst.

"Thus winds up Bayly with his gruesome description of a man's life from conception to death. Finally

we come to Dr. Isaac Watts in his *Divine and Moral Songs for Children.* Dr. Watts too, reminds children of early death and gaping Hell:

> "Tis dangerous to offend a God
> Whose power and vengeance none can tell.
> One stroke of His Almighty rod
> Will send young sinners straight to Hell!

"While I am writing these lines, Herbert Asbury's book *Up From Methodism* is lying before me on the table and I cannot resist the temptation of quoting a few paragraphs to illustrate the Calvinist concept of God. It represents a terrifying experience generated by the prayerful rites of childhood. He says:

> My uncle was an extraordinarily pious man—an official of our church and Sunday school and a leader to entice the sinner from his wicked ways and lead him to the true religion of Methodism. He frowned on laughter! There was little joy in his home. A laugh seemed to make him uncomfortable and start a train of dismal religious thought. Every night after supper, his living room was given over to family prayer. I frequently spent the evening with his youngest son, my cousin, who was also my best friend and playmate, and was compelled to absorb the nightly doses of religion and listen to the dreadful things God would do to us if we strayed from the path of righteousness. The whole atmosphere turned gray and gloomily oppressive as my uncle rose from his seat and announced: "We will now have prayers." We sat for a moment in silence, myself seeing goblins leering at me from every shaded corner of the room and my mind raced madly over the day to discover what sin I had done. We might have been at a funeral! Here was a fine home built for human happiness turned into a forbidding mausoleum by the mere mention of God. My uncle waited in silence a moment; then he laid reverent

hands on the Bible. I was in an agony of fright. I felt that something was crushing me and that something was my uncle's God—an avenging monster ready to devour me for my sins. God was in the house and I was afraid. Then my uncle read from the Bible. He read without joy. He read it as if it were a sentence of death, slowly and solemnly, dwelling with horrible emphasis upon those verses which promised damnation. And at the end of the reading, he closed the Bible. I had a devilish itch which afflicts the youngsters but I was afraid to scratch because God was in the room and we know how He would punish us if we moved. Then my uncle would say, "Let us pray!" We knelt on the hard carpet while his voice soared in an appeal to the Lord to give "some of this and some of that", to bless us and make us prosperous and in effect, to hell with such infidels as Jews and Catholics. Then he rose slowly to his feet and passed into the room, without speaking. Nearly always afterwards I awoke in my bed in the throes of a nightmare, pursued by devils, shrieking. I was to be cooked in the fires of Hell. Every night year after year this sort of thing went in most homes in my native town and in many homes throughout America. It was a long time before I could shake off the effect of this religious indoctrination. It stole the years of my youth from me.*

And here are the childhood experiences of one of the leading American writers of African origin, Richard Wright (1908-1960) as related in his autobiography:

Granny was ardent member of the *Seventh-day Adventist* Church and I was compelled to make a pretence of worshipping her God which was her exaction for my keep. The elders of her church expounded

*"An Open Letter to Christian Churches," Aziz ul Hassan Abbasi, *The Voice of Islam*, Karachi, September 1963, pp. 647-653.

a gospel clogged with images of vast lakes of eternal fire, of seas vanishing, of valleys of dry bones, of the sun burning to ashes, of the moon turning to blood, of stars falling to the earth, of a wooden staff being transformed into a serpent, of voices speaking out of clouds, of men walking upon water, of God riding whirlwinds, of water changing into wine, of the dead rising and living, of the blind seeing, of the lame walking; a salvation that teemed with fantastic beasts having multiple heads and horns and eyes and feet; sermons of statues possessing heads of gold, shoulders of silver, legs of brass and feet of clay; a cosmic tale that began before time and ended with the clouds of the sky rolling away at the Second Coming of Christ; chronicles that concluded with the *Armageddon*: dramas thronged with all the billions of human beings who had ever lived or died as God judged the quick and the dead.

While listening to the vivid language of the sermons, I was pulled with emotional belief but as soon as I went out of the church and saw the bright sunshine and felt the throbbing life of the people in the city streets, I knew that none of it was true and that nothing would happen. (p. 89)

Most of my schoolmates worked mornings, evenings and Saturdays; they earned enough to buy their clothes and books and they had money in their pockets at school. To see a boy go into a grocery store at noon recess and let his eyes roam over filled shelves and pick out what he wanted—even a dime's worth—was a hair-breadth short of a miracle to me. But when I broached the idea of my working to Granny, she would have none of it; she laid down the injunction that I could not work on Saturdays while I slept under her roof. Whenever I argued that Saturdays were the only days on which I could earn any worth-while sum, Granny looked me straight in the eyes and quoted Scripture:

"BUT THE SEVENTH DAY IS THE SABBATH OF THE LORD THY GOD; IN IT THOU SHALT NOT DO

ANY WORK, THOU NOR THY SON NOR THY DAUGHTER, NOR THY MANSERVANT NOR THY MAID SERVANT NOR THINE OX NOR THINE ASS NOR ANY OF T'"Y CATTLE NOR THY STRANGER THAT IS WITHIN THY GATES: THAT THY MAN-SERVANT AND THY MAID SERVANT MAY REST AS WELL AS THOU."

And that was the final word. Though we lived on the borderline of actual starvation, I could not bribe Granny with a promise of half or two thirds of my salary: her answer was no and never. I told Granny that she was not responsible for my soul and she replied that I was a minor, that my soul's fate rested in her hands and that I had no word to say in the matter. (p. 110).

There were more violent quarrels in our deeply religious home than in the home of a gangster, a burglar or a postitute, a fact which I used to hint gently to Granny and which did my cause no good. Granny bore the standard for God but she was always fighting. The peace that passes understanding never dwelt with us. I too fought; but I fought because I felt I had to keep from being crushed to fend off continuous attack. But Granny and Aunt Addie quarrelled and fought not only with me but with each other over minor points of religious doctrine or over some imagined infraction of what they chose to call their moral code. Whenever I found religion in my life, I found strife; the attempt of one individual or group to rule another in the name of God. The naked will to power always seemed to walk in the wake of a hymn. (p. 119).*

How could such a boy grow up with anything but the deepest hatred of the only religion he knew? As soon as he was old enough, he ran away from home to live a life of utter poverty in Chicago where he

**Black Boy*: *A Record of Childhood and Youth*, Richard Wright, Harper & Brothers Publishers, New York, 1945.

joined the Communist Party. Although he soon grew disillusioned with Communism and broke with the Party in 1940, he remained staunchly leftist, materialist and atheist.

The Christian doctrine of Original Sin is directly responsible for the theological inferiority of women in the Church. According to the Creation story in the present versions of *Genesis* in the Bible, since it was Eve who allegedly tempted Adam to eat of the forbidden fruit, the woman is condemned by the Church Fathers as the most potent source of sin and temptation. Thus some Greek Orthodox monasteries to this day not only prohibit any women from entering the premises but even female domestic animals! **In the Holy Quran, there is no theological basis for women's inferiority.** Adam and Eve were EQUALLY guilty of disobedience to God's command. The Quran asserts that Satan—not Eve—tempted Adam. The slight superiority of man over woman is taught by Quran and Hadith, rests upon natural physical and psychological factors. The Holy Quran promises the virtuous woman a reward in the Hereafter equal to the pious man:

> Lo! men who surrender unto Allah and women who surrender, and men who believe and women who believe and men who obey and women who obey and men who speak the truth and women who speak the truth and men who presevere in righteousness and women who persevere and men who are humble and women who are humble and men who give alms and women who give alms and men who fast and women who fast, and men who guard their modesty and women who guard their modesty and men who remember Allah much and women who remember—

> Allah hath prepared for them forgiveness and a vast reward.
> [XXXIII ; 35]

The inferiority of woman in Christianity is argued on the same theological basis as in Judaism. St. Paul says :

> For Eve ate first of the forbidden fruit and then gave it to Adam, so the man was not deceived but the woman was thoroughly deceived and came to be in sin and transgression.

Christian missionaries who never cease harping on the allegedly inferior role of the woman in Islam ought to read what St. Paul has to say on the subject in their own Scriptures:

> I would have you know that the head of every man is Christ and the head of the woman is the man and the head of Christ is God. Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonoureth his head. But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered, dishonoureth her head for that is as if she were shaven. For if the woman be not covered, let her also be shorn but if it be a shame for a woman to be shorn or shaven, let her be covered. For a man indeed ought not to cover his head for as much as he is the image and glory of God but the woman is the glory of the man. For the man is not of the woman but the woman is from the man. Neither was the man created for the woman but the woman for the man. For this cause ought the woman to have power on her head because of the angels.
> (First Corinthians 11 ; 3-10)

In other words, the woman ought to cover her head as a sign of her *inferiority*. This is contrary to Judaism and Islam, where it is the practice for *both* men and women to keep their heads covered, especially

while engaged in formal worship. St. Paul demands that women's inferiority be expressed inside the Church as well:

> Let your women keep silence in the churches for it is not permitted unto them to speak but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the Law. And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home for it is disgraceful for women to speak in the church.
>
> (First Corinthians 14 : 34-35)

The Christian ideal of marriage is expressed in the following verses of their Scriptures where St. Paul commands:

> Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands as unto the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife even as Christ is the head of the Church and he is the saviour of the body. Therefore as the Church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives subordinate themselves to their own husbands in everything. Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church and gave himself for it for we are members of his body, of his flesh and his bones. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother and shall be joined unto his wife and they two shall be one flesh. This is a great mystery but I speak concerning Christ and the Church. (Ephesians 5 : 22-32)

Thus, contrary to the propaganda of Christian missionaries in Muslim lands, the modern concept of female freedom and equality could not possibly have been derived from the original teaching of Christianity but rather has been the result of the capitulation of the Church to the socialist precepts of Karl Marx. According to the teachings of St. Paul in the Christian scriptures, *divorce is absolutely prohibited.* The official

Baltimore Catholic Catechism says:

> Once a man and woman are united in the sacrament of Matrimony, they remain husband and wife until the death of either of them. A separation, a divorce or an attempted marriage with another person does not destroy the marriage bond. It is for the good of husband and wife. for the bodily and spiritual welfare of their children and the good of society that God has decreed that the marriage bond can be broken only by death because Christ has said, "what therefore God has joined together let no man put asunder."

> "Do you not know, brethren, (for I speak to those who know law) that the Law has dominion over a man as long as he lives? For the married woman is bound by the law while her husband is alive but if her husband dies, she is set free from the law of her husband. Therefore, while her husband is alive, she will be called an adulteress if she be with another man but if her husband dies, she is set free from the law of the husband so that she is not an adulteress if she has been with another man. (Romans 7 : 1-3)

Although widows are permitted to remarry, St. Paul insists that it is better if they do not:

> A woman is bound as long as her husband is alive but if her husband dies, she is free. Let her marry whom she pleases, only let it be in the Lord. But she will be more blessed, in my judgment. if she remains as she is. And I think that I also have the spirit of God.
>
> (First Corinthians 7 : 39-40)

The Hindu religion goes even further and prohibits widow remarriage altogether. The law of Manu says that the widow should burn herself on the pyre of her husband in order to quickly join her beloved. As in Hinduism, Buddhism and all other monastic creeds, in sharp contrast to Judaism and Islam,

Christianity regards celibacy as the ideal:

> He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord but he that is married careth for the things that are of the world, how he may please his wife. There is a difference also between a wife and a virgin. The unmarried woman careth for the things of the Lord that she may be holy both in body and in spirit but she that is married careth for the things of the world, how she may please her husband. And this I speak for your own profit, not that I may cast a snare upon you but for that which is comely and that ye may attend upon the Lord without distraction.
>
> (First Corinthians 7 : 32-35)

The Baltimore Catholic Catechism adds that parents commit a great sin if they attempt to compel their sons or daughters to marry when they prefer to remain single. In contrast, the Holy Prophet is reported in the Hadith to command parents to marry all their children as soon after puberty as possible; and if they fail to do so, they will be responsible for their sins!

In Christianity, marriage is a sacrament as taught by the present versions of the Gospels:

> And some of the Pharisees coming up asked him, testing him, "Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife?" But he answered and said to them, "What did Moses command you?" They said, "Moses permitted us to write a notice of dismissal and to put her away". But Jesus said to them, "By reason of the hardness of your heart, he wrote you that Commandment but from the beginning of Creation, God made them male and female. For this cause a man shall leave his father and mother and cleave to his wife and the two shall become one flesh. Therefore now they are no longer two but one flesh. What God has joined together, let no man put asunder." And in the house his disciples again asked him concerning this. And he said to them, "Whoever puts away his wife and marries another, commits

adultery against her and if the wife puts away her husband and marries another, she commits adultery."

That is why the Christian is apt to look upon Islam's permission of divorce and polygamy as sexual promiscuity! As one Christian missionary writes :

> Islam's whole concept of a democratic society is rendered practically valueless by the fact that the female half of the population holds almost the status of pariahs with practically no rights at all. The criterion of any institution of human society concerns the sex relationship that it fosters. Socially, Mohammedanism's worst failure is at this point. The Mohammedan system is nothing more or less than unchecked promiscuity. Consequently, women have almost no rights. A little girl may be married to a man of sixty. Her place is an inferior one and she is frequently beaten. A few indulgent fathers have their daughters taught to read the Quran but it would be fatal to a woman's reputation to know how to write. She might write a letter to someone other than her own husband. Infraction of the moral code is for her a capital crime. For the man it is a minor offense. Taken as a whole, family life in Arabia is a very unlovely thing to see. The husband dominates over his wife. She is his plaything, almost his slave. She is divorced at her husband's whim and there is no doubt at all the Arab women dread divorce and that if they had their way, nine out of ten divorces would not take place. The relations of the sexes are reduced to the level of eating and drinking. As a man enjoys a new sort of potatoes every day, why should he not enjoy a new wife every day? This attitude is the blight which Mohammedanism has carried with it everywhere.*

This is the sort of malicious propaganda that the Christian missionary has propagated against family

*_The Arab at Home_, Paul W. Harrison, Thomas Y. Crowell Company, New York, 1924, pp. 258-260.

life among the Muslims for generations and as a Muslim convert, a co-wife and mother in strict *Purdah* who has lived in a traditional sector in Lahore for more than fifteen years and en route to Pakistan by sea, visited families in Egypt, Sudan and Saudi Arabia, I can confidently assert that everything mentioned in the quote is a vicious lie. Among the traditional families of observant orthodox Muslims I have seen, kinship ties are extremely close. The family is very strong, much more so than anything that could be imagined in Europe or America. The relationship between those husbands and wives respected by the community is characterized by loyalty and faithfulness. Divorce, at least among Pakistani Muslims, is very rare. Most of the arranged marriages I have seen take place within my husband's family between cousins, have been successful, happy and enduring. While the Muslim husband is the master of the house, I have never seen wives treated like slaves, even among the poor. There is as much affection and loyalty between husbands and wives among the Muslims as any other people.

Why are Christians so horrified by Islam's permission of polygamy? Dr. Kenneth Cragg answers this question when he writes :

> A bond between plural marriage and plural worship may seem at first an odd notion. Yet it is real. Is not idolatry really the attempt to take the part for the whole? Yet such is also the error of the setting of sexuality in any other context than a full self-giving. Must not the inner love of husband and wife be as securely undivided as their love for God? Pluralism in worship diversifies an allegiance that should be unique; so also do concurrent and consecutive marriages. A man's whole heart cannot be wholly in two

places either Godward or wifeward. Plural marriage is a sort of polytheism of the self. In Islam, only marriage legitimatizes sexual relations but in doing so, it does not require them to be uniquely directed. Or phrasing it negatively, while legally a couple, they are not spiritually a single flesh. Being spiritually of a single flesh is the whole meaning of the Christian sacrament of marriage where potential two-fleshness (*i.e.* the physical feasibility of divorce) is constantly transcended in the achievement within mutual commitment of married unity under God. Any marriage pragmatically is dissoluble but not essentially one that God has joined together since it is daily accomplishing the meaning of its perpetual nature. It is this which Islamic concepts do not allow. If it is true that although monogamy is the only secure foundation of sexual equality, it may be fostered by factors which do not either admit or derive from this source. This is happening widely with the growth of female education, the sense of economic need for family limitation, the abolition of the veil and female seclusion as incompatible with the dignities of womanhood and the self-respect of men.*

In Islam marriage is a *contract* which aims to legitimatize sexual relations and create the foundation of a healthy family atmosphere for the rearing of the children. In Christianity, it is a *sacrament.* The teachings of Islam, in forbidding sexual relations outside of marriage, put this prohibition into **practical** effect by making marriage, divorce, and remarriage as easy as possible so that there can be no excuse for illicit relations.

It has been said that the Islamic view of woman is a man's view while the Christian view of woman is a woman's

**The Dome and the Rock: Jerusalem Studies in Islam,* Kenneth Cragg, op. cit., pp. 158-160.

view. Devotees of a sentimental ideal of womanhood are apt to underestimate the human value of the Muslim standpoint and to talk as if Islam had lowered the social and moral position of Eastern women and caused their personal degradation, omitting altogether to take into account the fact that a considerable minority of the womanhood of Christendom (due to the prohibition of legal polygamy) has been degraded (because of being barred from marriage) to a depth which every good Muslim surveys with horror while a larger number are debarred from all fulfilment of their natural functions which the Muslim regards as a great wrong. Fault is found with our faith by most Western writers because it does not enjoin strict monogamy and the very mission of Muhammad (may God bless and keep him) has been questioned merely because he had more wives than one. I would point out that there is no more bright example of monogamic marriage in all history than the twenty-six years' happy union of our Holy Prophet with Khadijah. Therefore he furnished an example of perfect monogamic marriage and he also furnished an example of perfect polygamic marriage. Strict monogamy has never been really observed in Western lands, but for the sake of the fetish of monogamy, a countless multitude of women and their children have been sacrificed and made to suffer cruelly. Islam destroys all fetishes which always tend to outcast numbers of God's creatures. In Europe side by side with woman-worship, we see the degradation and despair of women. The Islamic system, when completely practiced, holds every man responsible for his behaviour towards every woman and for the consequences of his behaviour. It likewise does away with much of the romance which has been woven round the facts of sexual intercourse by Western writers. Romance is an illusion and we need never mourn the loss of an illusion. Take modern European literature—the most widely read—and you will find the object of man's life on earth depicted as the love of woman—in the ideal form as the love of one woman—the elect, whom he discovers

**after trying more than one!** When that one woman is discovered, the reader is led to suppose that a union of souls takes place between the two. And that is the goal of life. It is not commonsense. It is rubbish. But it is traceably a product of the teaching of the Christian Church regarding marriage. Woman is an alluring but fordidden creature, by nature sinful except when a mystical union typifying that of Christ and his Church occurs, thanks to priestly benediction. The teaching of Islam is altogether different. There is no such thing as union of two human souls and those who spend their lives in seeking it, go far astray. Sympathy more or less and love there may be. But every human soul is solitary from the cradle to the grave unless and until it finds its way of approach to Allah. It is free and independent of every other human soul; it has its full responsibility and must bear its own burden and finds its own way of approach through the duties and amid the cares of life. There is no difference between the woman and the man in this respect. *In marriage there is no merging of personalities.* Each remains distinct and independent. They have simply entered into an engagement for the performance of certain duties toward each other, an engagement which can be hallowed and made permanent by mutual regard and love. If that regard and love be not forthcoming, the engagement had best be terminated by divorce. Marriage in Islam is not a sacrament—*i.e.* of mystic value in itself—still less is it a bondage. It is a civil contract between one free servant of Allah and another free servant of Allah. Allah has ordained between them mutual love, has clearly defined their rights over one another and has prescribed for their observance certain rules of honour and decency. If they cannot feel the love and fear they may transgress the rules, the contract should be ended. The woman retains her own complete personality, her own opinion and initiative, her own property and her own name in the case of polygamic as of monogamic marriage and in the case of polygamic marriage, she can claim her own establishment. It there-

fore does not very greatly matter from her point of view, whether monogamy or polygamy be the prevalling order of society. In practice, strict monogamy is a cause of much unhappiness and also some serious social evils, The facility of divorce, which was not in the original Western code of monogamy, has now been introduced into most Western countries but there it involves so much publicity and scandal as to be almost itself another social evil that is certainly not the case with the Islamic method of divorce which is executed in private and not in the public courts. Polygamy is little practised in the Muslim world today but the permission is there to witness to the truth that marriage was made for man and woman—not man and woman for marriage.*

The man-made character of Christianity is amply revealed even by the most cursory study of its history. Here is a chronology of the development of the Trinity :

A.D. 32, About this time the Gospels recorded, "I ascend unto my *Father* and your *Father* and to my God and your God."

A.D. 57, About this time Paul wrote, "There is no other God but One. To us there is but One God and *Father* and *Son*, Jesus Christ"

A.D. 96. About this time Clement wrote, "Christ was sent by God and the Apostles were sent by Christ."

A.D. 120, The Apostle's Creed begins to be known to the Church. It says, "I believe in God, the *Father* Almighty."

A.D. 150. Justin Martyr about this time began with Platonic philosophy to corrupt Christian simplicity.

**Islamic Culture*, Muhammad Marmaduke Pickthall, Ferozsons, Lahore, 1927, pp. 137-145,

A.D. 170. The word "Trias" first occurs in Christian literature,

A.D. 200. The word "Trinitas" is first used by Tertullian.

A.D. 230. Origen writes against prayers being offered to Christ.

A.D. 260. Sabellius taught that Father, Son and Holy Spirit are three names for the same God.

A.D. 300. No trinitarian form of prayer is yet known to the Church.

A.D. 310. Lactanius writes that "Christ never called himself God !"

A.D. 320. Eusebius writes; "Christ teaches us to call his Father, the true God and to worship Him."

A.D. 325. The Council of Nicea agrees to call Christ God of God, very God of very God.

A.D. 350 Great conflicts in the church about the doctrine of Trinity.

A.D. 370. The doxology, "Glory be to the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost" composed and objected to as a novelty.

A.D. 381. The Council of Constantinople gives the finishing touch to the doctrine of "three Persons in One God."

A.D. 383. The Emperor Theodosius threatened to punish all who would not believe in and worship the Trinity.*

Therefore, the doctrine of Trinity, imposed by imperial decree, did not become Christian dogma until nealy four centuries after the birth of Christ ! Orthodoxy was then established by force.

No vital interest of the Christian faith justified the extravagant denunciations in which the theological partisan-

**Missing Documents from Gospel of Barnabas*, Adam Peerbhai, Islamic Institute, Durban, 1967, p. 28.

ship so recklessly and ruthlessly indulged in the post-Nicene period. So far the Church had managed to survive both neglect and persecution and had grown into an imperium that attracted Constantine. He sought to strengthen his empire and stabilize his power with the help of Christianity through which he hoped to secure the unity of his subjects. What Constantine failed to see, however, was the almost inevitable effect of the interaction of State and Church which, in spite of theocracy of the Old Testament and the insistence of Jesus himself on the Kingdom of Heaven, came to be conceieved by his followers, as he became a more and more remote figure with the passage of time, as separate entities with undefined jurisdictions and unlimited ambitions. The Church imperium was already engaged in the process of formulating creeds and confessions that would confine the wandering imaginations of its members within the limits of Orthodoxy. The Christian Emperor on the throne was not so desirous perhaps as the Church for the success of its doctrine, but all the same, he was anxious in his own interests for uniformity and willing to lend to the Church the support of the civil arm. In the ante-Nicene period, only ecclesiastical penalties such as reproof, deposition or excommunication could be imposed. In the post-Nicene period, the union of Church and State transformed theological error into legal offence.*

As a result, even the most humble Christian became obsessed with intricate theological questions. In describing Constantinople, the capital of Byzantium in the fourth century, Gregory of Nyassa wrote :

> This city is full of mechanics and slaves who are all profound theologians and preach in the shops and streets. If you desire a man to change a piece of silver, he informs

**My Life A Fragment*, Maulana Muhammad Ali, Shaikh Muhammad Ashraf, Lahore. 1946, pp. 327-328.

you wherein the Son differs from the Father. If you ask the price of a loaf of bread, you are told by way of reply that the Son is inferior to the Father and if you inquire whether the bath is ready, the answer is that the Son was made out of nothing!*

Early Christian fanatics were the most vehement enemies of science and learning which they condemned as dangerous heresy :

The libraries of Alexandria were the most important as well as the most celebrated in the ancient world. Under the enlightened rule of the Ptolemies, a society of scholars and men of science was attracted to their capital but in 389 or 391 A,D., an edict of the Emperor Theodosius ordered the destruction of the Serapeum, and this library was pillaged and destroyed by zealous Christians under the rule of their Bishop Theophilus. That this destruction of pagan lore was quite characteristic of the zealots who executed the decree of Theodosius is amply evidenced by their destruction of Christian lore itself that was tainted by "heresy." Every modern scholar of Christian theology warns us to handle with caution the sources of information that are now available for a study of the various "heresies" because they are almost always the polemical writings of their successful adversaries who not only crushed the minorities but also destroyed all their religious literature.**

What was Western society like in contrast to the Muslim world when Christianity reigned unchallenged over Europe?

Western Christendom and Islam not only represented two distinct systems of religion; they were societies extraordinarly unlike from almost every point of view. For the

**Ibid.*, p, 337.

***Ibid*.. pp. 350-351.

greater part of the Middle Ages and over most of its area, the West formed a society primarily agrarian, feudal and monastic at a time when the strength of the Muslim world lay in its great cities, wealthy courts and long lines of communication. The Western ideals were essentially celibate, sacerdotal and hierarchical.. Islam was in principal egalitarian, enjoying a remarkable freedom of speculation with no priests and no monasteries built into the basic structure of society as they were in the West. It is certain that the Islamic countries produced in the ninth, tenth and eleventh centuries a greater bulk and variety of learned and scientific works than medieval Christendom in any similar length of time, A comparison of the literary catalogues of the West with the lists of books available to Muslim scholars makes a painful impression on a Western mind and the contrast came as a bombshell to the Latin scholars of the twelth century who first had their eyes opened to the difference. During this medieval period two figures stand out as embodiments of two cultures. They are almost exact contemporaries : in the West, Gerbert, who was born about 940 and died as Pope in 1003; in the East, Ibn Sina who was born in 986 and died in 1037. The courts Gerbert knew were those of Hugh Capet and Otto III—rulers living from hand to mouth with ideas of splendour contrasting sharply with their practical impotence. The schools he knew were those of monasteries and cathedrals, certainly small and ill-equipped with books. From these scanty sources, Gerbert composed his own jejune works—a chart showing the various branches of rhetoric, a text-book of arithmetic, a small specimen of dialectic and, on those foundations, he built a model of the planetary system, an abacus and a complicated clock. Ibn Sina was born at Bukhara about forty years later than Gerbert. In contrast to Gerbert, the priest, monk, prelate, Pope and political intriguer among laymen, powerless to fulfil his grandiose plans, Ibn Sina was a layman, an official, a physician and a court philosopher, Ibn Sina has left us a description of the library of the Sultan of Bukhara. It was

contained in many rooms, each piled with chests of books and each devoted to a single subject—language and poetry, law, logic, medicine and so on—with a catalogue from which it was possible to get a general view of the ancient writers on each science. There is no need to pursue the contrast any further. Ibn Sina's own works were in bulk and importance a product worthy of the mine from which they were dug when the works of Gerbert were soon forgotten.*

Yet the favourite polemic of the Christian missionary is that Islam in responsible for the material backwardness and poverty of the present-day Muslims. So successfully has Christian missionary propaganda dinned into the minds of the rising generations in every Muslim country that Islam is the enemy of scientific and economic progress, that our ruling classes, who have been carefully trained in their missionary schools, take this for granted as axiomatic !

The globe-trotter sees the Arab as a hopelessly dirty individual and his community as a hopelessly primitive, stagnant society in which even the desire for improvement is lacking. The man who has lived in Arabia long enough to see things as they are has a very different viewpoint. The society in which he is immersed and has come to love is made up of men and women of abilities equal to his own. In some ways they are his superiors. Nothing should be impossible for such men and for a society made up of them, But on prolonged acquaintance, nothing is more obvious than the fact that many things are impossible for them. In the days of Abraham, the inhabitants of Arabia lived the same lives, ate presumably the same food, wore the same clothes and thought the same

**Western Views of Islam in the Middle Ages*, R. W. Southern, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1962, pp. 7-12.

thoughts as they do today. It is not that progress has been slow. There has been no progress (p. 275). In the days of Abraham, the Arabs understood the world fully as well as they understand it now. Their bitter poverty has not been softened. In the past two thousand years, the Arabs have gained no new appreciation of truth nor have they advanced a whit in their appreciation and love of beauty. Probably not a race in the world has remained more completely stagnant during this time than they. And that stagnation has not been due to any lack of those happenings which, in our ignorance, we term accidents of history. In the days of the early Abbasid caliphs, the most advanced philosophy, science and medicine in the world were to be found in Bagdad. These developments were the culmination of a beginning that dated back to the Damascus caliphate and even to the days of Mohammad himself. There was no need to pray for favorable accidents of history with such a start. But whether we think of the Abbasid caliphate in Bagdad or the empire of the Moguls in India or the Omayyad dynasty in Spain, the great civilizations of the Muslims seem always to come out at the same door as they went in and the military conquest, religious propaganda and intellectual activity remain sterile. The student of history can find no more melancholy spots in the world than Medina, Damascus, Bagdad, Delhi or Cairo, each the seat of a former Muslim civilization which promised to be the beginning of real progress and each now sunk to the dead level of hopless Muhammadan stagnation, its only hope some stimulus from the outside (pp. (333-334). Mohammedanism is not simply sterlie of itself. It has so developed prejudice and pride in its devotees that no such determined enemies of progress are to be found anywhere but Mohammedan states and Mohammedan communities There is no religion in the world that has so developed self-sufficiency, intolerance and pride in its followers and so walled them off from everything that could enter from

outside and contribute to their material, social and spiritual progress. (p. 253).*

Is it Islam or the departure from Islam that is responsible for the present-day decadence of the Muslims? Is Christianity really the hand-maiden of "progress"? Ethiopia has been a "Christian" country for nearly two thousand years but what is the result? An English explorer describes his childhood experiences in Ethiopia as follows :

My father was British Minister in Addis Adaba and I was born there in 1910 in one of the mud huts which in those days housed the Legation. When I returned to England I had already witnessed sights such as few people had ever seen. I had watched the priests dancing at Timkat before the Ark of the Covenant to the muffled throbbing of the silver drums. I had watched the hierarchy of the Ethiopian Church, magnificent in their many coloured garments, blessing the waters. I had seen the armies going forth to fight in the Great Rebellion of 1916. For days they passed across the plain in front of the Legation. I had heard the wailing when Ras Lul Seged's army was wiped out trying to check Negus Michail's advance and had witnessed the wild rejoicing which proclaimed the final victory. Nothing could have appeared more barbaric than this frenzied tide of men which surged past the royal pavilion throughout the day to the thunder of war drums and the blare of war horns. This was no ceremonial review. These men had just returned after fighting desperately for their lives and they were still wild with the excitement of those frantic hours. The blood on the clothes which they had stripped from the dead and draped round their horses was barely dry. They came past in waves—horsemen half concealed in dust and a great horde of footmen. Screaming

**The Arab at Home*, op. cit.

out their deeds of valour and brandishing their weapons, they came right up to the steps of the throne whence the court chamberlains beat them back with long wands. The most moving moment of that widly exciting day was when the drums suddenly stopped and, in utter silence, a few hundred men in torn, white everyday clothes came slowly down the long avenue of waiting troops led by a young boy. It was Ras Lul Seged's son bringing in the remnants of his father's army which had gone into battle five thousand strong.*

These men are all Christians and yet they represent a far more barbaric society than anything known in Arabia or other Muslim countries. From the fifth to the thirteenth century, Christian Europe was scarcely any more "progressive." Only the resurgence of the paganism, atheism and scular humanism of ancient Greece and Rome during the "Renaissance", stimulated by the intellectual activity of the Muslim scientists and philosophers and the *violent rebellion against the Church*, brought about the social, economic and scientific revolution which has brought the West to its present world domination. Yet the missionary is so hypocritical and intellectually dishonest that he applauds the defeat of Christian temporal power and finally its strange marriage with secularism and imperialism which he boasts with the most intense pride as his chief accomplishment!

The Protestant or Roman Catholic missionary is never simply a Christian; he is always a **Western** Christian carrying with him the fresh and modern outlook of the Western world as well as the Gospel. Often the Muslim

**Arabian Sands*, Wilfred Thesiger, E. P. Dutton, New York, 1959, pp. 4-6.

community was willing to run the risk of misisionary religious influence in order to avail itself of the medicine, schools, orphanages, science and social welfare that the missionary brought. More than that, in bringing these things, the missionary identified his kind of Christianity with progress and social concern—two things that Eastern religions, both Christian and Muslim, seldom included.*

Christian missionary propaganda never fails to emphasize the poverty and social and material backwardness of the Muslim world as if the Muslims had a virtual monopoly on poverty, disease and illiteracy. They even try to infer that Islam is responsible for the present-day misery of the Muslims! But is it Islam that is really responsible? If so, why can these same deplorable conditions be found in the most staunchly "Christian" lands of Southern Europe and Latin America which are certainly no more highly "developed" than the Muslim East!

To demonsrate that conditions some "Christian" lands are certainly not any better than Muslim Asia or Africa, here is an except from the biography of the most celebrated bull-fighter in Spain—Manuel Benitez Cordobes—as described by his elder sister :

"I cried for my brother, Manolo, the day he was born and I haven't finished crying for him yet." says Angelita Benitez. "It was a warm afternoon in May 1936 just before the war. I was fourteen years old then but I knew what was happening. I could hear my mother screaming. Then I heard the baby's cry. I started to cry too. I didn't want him. He was another mouth to eat our food. Our house was on the Calle Ancha and we lived on the second

*_The Lands Between : The Middle East,_ John S. Badeau, Friendship Press, New York, 1958.

floor. We went up on an outside staircase. There was one room and one window. We were five children and we had a table, a chest of drawers, four chairs and two beds. My mother and father slept in one bed; we slept in the other. The one important day in Palma every year was September 8th, a feast day. In the morning, everyone went to Mass and in the evening, there was the procession. The men carried the statue of the Virgin out of the church on their shoulders and in the centre of Palma where the procession passed, it was the custom to hang an embroidered bed-cover from the balcony when the statue went by. But that was only once a year. The rest of the time it was work. Like everyone else, my father worked in the fields of the rich landowners. We worked from dawn until dark when we couldn't see anymore. By the time I was nine, I had forgotten how to laugh." With the end of the war came the years of hunger. Drought and famine gripped the villages of Andalusia and Father Carlos Anchez, Palma's priest, remembers the hungry children who came to him for food. Among them, Manuel Benitez was brought to the priest by Angelita. "He can't eat, Don Carlos," she explained. ' Maybe, you can do something for him." Father Sanchez did what he could, but the reason Manuel couldn't eat was because he was already half-starved. The hunger pains gave him stomach cramps and eating was a torture, Soon a new staple appeared on the Benitez supper table—grass boiled in a pot "But sometimes we went for three days with nothing to eat," says Angelita. "Then one morning my mother got sick. She couldn't get up from the bed. On the sixth day she was much worse. She had the fever and was so weak, she couldn't raise her arms. That night we all lighted candles and stood around her bed. Manolo was so small that his head hardly came up over the edge of the bed. He was crying. After a while she whispered to me, 'Angelita, I give you your brothers and sisters. You will have to be their mother now.' A few minutes later she was dead. She was 36. In the morning they brought a

coffin from the carpenter's shop. Then my uncles closed the box and took it away."*

Actually there is hardly any more reactionary and oppressive institution in history than the priest-dominated Christian Church.

The effect of the Muslim conquests on what was left of the Roman Empire was to divide it more seriously than ever. The Emperor Leo III at Constantinople incurred the displeasure of Pope Gregory II by his efforts to obtain reform in the fact of the onrushing Muslim "peril." Recoiling from Arab and Christian quarters concerning the idolatrous veneration of images and pictures in the Christian churches, the Emperor forbade in 726 A.D. their further use, thus fathering the first iconoclastic movement in Christian history. There was immediate remonstrance both in the East and the West. In the East, Leo used his army to enforce his decrees. But Rome was far enough away to make good its disobedience.

What was more, the Pope called a Roman synod and obtained an action excommunicating those who opposed the use of pictures, namely, the emperor and those who sided with him. The emperor retaliated by removing Sicily and southern Italy from the Pope's spiritual jurisdiction. This left the Pope in a precarious situation, for northern Italy was occupied by Lombards and they had set their hearts on the conquest of Rome. So the Pope called for help from Charles Martel whose success against the Muslims made his aid worth seeking. Both Gregory and Charles were to die before that help was forthcoming but Charles' son, Pippin the Short, invaded Italy, brought the Lombard king to terms and made a present of the province of Ravenna to the Pope. He thus caused the Pope to fix the orientation of the papacy towards the trans-Alpine lands rather than towards the East

**Or I'll Dress You in the Mourning*, Larry Collins and Dominique Lapierre, Simon and Schuster Inc., New York, 1968.

and without knowing it, laid the foundations of a huge, unstable western empire. The Pope gained much; he was now not only the largest landowner in Italy with an annual income of over a million dollars but a temporal sovereign, the ruler of the "States of the Church", as they came to be called, and very important these were to him. The Popes were to cling tenaciously to their temporal sovereignty. From the first, it was possible for them to hope that they might replace the Byzantine emperor throughout the West. The fact that the province of Ravenna until the Lombard invasion had been directly under the emperor's jurisdiction placed the Popes in the position of taking the emperor's lands away from him. In this, their minds were apparently set at rest by an extraordinary forgery. Known as the "Donation of Constantine", this forgery represents the Emperor Constantine granting to the Popes not only spiritual supremacy over the whole church but also "temporal domain over Rome, Italy, and the provinces, places and cities of the Western regions." Not until the middle of the 15th century was the forgery successfully discredited. Meanwhile the Popes made good use of it. All in all, from 740 to 1870 the Popes firmly held to their states of the Church and when bereft of them by King Victor Emmanuel, were outraged. In 1929 Mussolini restored the Pope's temporal sovereignty over the Vatican and the grounds immediately around it. Meanwhile a serious doctrinal split between East and West was brewing. In 589 A.D. a Western council met in Spain in support of the "Athanasian Creed". The rift of opinion between East and West hung fire for several centuries. Finally in 876 A.D., a synod at Constantinople condemned the Pope for his political activities. The action was part of the East's entire rejection of the Pope's claim to universal jurisdiction over the Church. The final and complete break came in 1054 A.D. when the long-standing schism led the Pope to excommunicate the Patriarch of Constantinople and the Patriarch to hurl back anathemas at the Pope. Since then the two branches of the Christian Church—the Roman Catholic and the Greek

Orthodox—have gone their separate ways.*

As it can clearly be seen from here, the rule of the Popes in Rome versus the Patriarch in Constantinople was as much a power-struggle as between any worldly monarchs.

The corruption of the Papacy is not limited to the past.

> The wealth of the Vatican is one of its most closely guarded secrets. Leading financiers give 2,000 million pounds as a conservative estimate of its world-wide business holdings. That makes Pope Paul easily the world's largest stock-holder and until now, all his Italian investments have been exempt from tax under the terms of the Lateran Pacts. These agreements were negotiated with Mussolini in the twenties when—as indemnity for papal possessions seized by the Italian State in 1860—the dictator paid over 18 million pounds. Now the Italian Government—a coalition of Christian Democrats, Socialists and Republicans—has declared that the pacts must be revised and the church must pay tax on its earnings, at least in Italy. Even though the total amount—perhaps less than 1 million pounds a year, after a 5 million backlog is paid off—seems modest compared with the size of the Church's wealth, Pope Paul VI and his financial advisers are fighting the move with all their strength. "The Vatican is no ordina-' stock holder," a highiy placed cleric from Pope Paul's Secretariat of State told me. "If we are obliged to pay tax, our charitable works around the world will suffer. The Holy See must oppose this move on grounds of principle." Today the Vatican has interests in an extraordinarily wide range of business firms. Airways, shipping, radio, television, electric power, chemicals, sugar, spaghetti, bathroom fixtures—the portfolio is estimated to contain

**Islam and its Contemporary Faiths*, Mahmud Brelvi, published by the author, Karachi, 1965 pp. 178-180.

between a tenth and fifth of Italy's total stocks. But the great bulk of investment lies outside Italy, most of it in North America. These Vatican holdings are of course quite separate from those of the Roman Catholic hierarchies in Canada and the U.S.A. "We are in real estate, industry, hotels, and television," a U.S. prelate told me. "We are at least as big Ford Motors, Shell Oil and Bethlehem Steel together. When Pope Paul said Mass in Yankee Stadium, he did it on Church property." From the U.S.A. comes the biggest share of "Peter's Pence", the fund which the Vatican collects annually from countries all round the world. Here again, the sums are secret. Probably more vital to the Holy See is the excellent financial counsel it receives on the state of the world market through bishops everywhere. Over all this, Pope Paul has absolute control. If he wished to keep a few millions in his mattress or to give them away, there would be nothing to prevent him. Indeed, Pope Benedict XV, who died soon after World War I, kept a desk drawer stuffed with banknotes for needy callers. His generousity once came near to emptying some papal coffers. More and more Catholics are becoming aware of these vast financial resources for which no balance sheets are ever published.*

Yet the devotees of the Roman Catholic Church are obliged to revere the Pope as the "Vicar of Christ on Earth," his pronouncements on doctrines of faith and dogma as infallible, and submit to the authority of the whole complicated ecclesiastical hierarchy. To quote the official Baltimore Catholic Catechism :

**What is Holy Orders?**

Holy Orders is the sacrament through which men receive the power and grace to perform the sacred duties of bishops, priests and other ministers of the Church. The distinction

*"The Peril to the Papacy," Charles Foley, *The Pakistan Times*, Lahore, May 5, 1969.

between clergy and laity is of divine origin, for first, Christ chose the twelve Apostles from among His disciples and in a special way deputed them for the exercise of spiritual ministrations and second, the Apostles who could not mistake the will of Christ, administered the sacraments of Holy Orders by consecrating bishops and by ordaining priests and deacons. A bishop is a priest who has the power of administering the sacrament of Holy Orders and makes him the ordinary minister of the sacrament of Confirmation. The other orders of ministers of the Church below those of priest and the major orders of deacon and subdeacon, are the four minor orders of acolyte, exorcist, lector or reader and porter. Before a man receives Holy Orders, he is constituted a member of the clerical state through the ceremony of tonsure in which hair is cut from his head in the form of a cross while he recites a verse from the Psalms to signify that he has dedicated himself to the service of God. A cardinal is a priest or bishop belonging to the group that has been especially selected to advise and assist the Pope in the government of the Church. Cardinals have the right of electing a new Pope after the death of the reigning Pontiff. An abbot is a priest who exercises over a religious community (monastery) jurisdiction which is similar in some respects to that exercised by a bishop over his diocese. A vicar-general is a priest appointed by a bishop to help him in the government of the diocese and for this purpose, he shares the bishop's power of jurisdiction.*

The administration of the Roman Catholic Church is modeled directly after the reforms of the pagan Roman emperor, Diocletcian, who thereby attempted to arrest the swift decay of the Roman Empire in the third century A.D.

**Understanding the Catholic Faith*, Father John A. O'Brien, op. cit., pp. 248-249.

**What are the effects of ordination to the priesthood?**

The effects of ordination to the priesthood are: first, an increase of sanctifying grace; second, sacramental grace, through which the priest has God's special help in his sacred ministry and third, a character, lasting forever which is a special sharing in the priesthood of Christ that gives the priest special supernatural powers.

**What are the chief supernatural powers of the priest?**

The chief supernatural powers of the priest are to change the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ in the holy sacrifice of the Mass and to forgive sins in the sacrament of Penance.

**Why should Catholics show reverence and honour to the priest?**

Catholics should show reverence and honour to the priest because he is the representative of Christ Himself and the dispenser of His mysteries.*

Islam rejects all forms of priesthood not only in practice but also on principle. While Judaism has had no priests since the destruction of the second temple in Jerusalem by the Romans in 70 A. D., Jews still hope some day to restore their priesthood after their Temple is rebuilt. Islam rejects the theory that man cannot worship God without priestly intermediaries and preaches that the spiritual equality of all men who have direct access to God at all times is essential to the doctrine of *Tauhid* or God's unity. In contrast to the complicated and mysterious rituals of the Roman Catholic and Greek Orthodox church which require special priests to perform them for the laity, the practices of Islam are so simple that anybody

**Ibid.*, 251-252.

can do them anywhere and at any place. The institution of the priesthood opens the door wide for unlimited moral corruption, social tyranny and exploitation, thus establishing a reactionary order of the most intense magnitude.

**What is an indulgence?**

An indulgence is the remission granted by the Church of the temporal punishment due to sins already forgiven. An indulgence does not take away sin. Neither does it take away the enternal punishment due to mortal sins. By an indulgence, the Church merely wipes out or lessens the temporal punishment due to sins already forgiven. The sufferings of the martyrs together with those of Christ, constitute a great treasury of satisfaction for sin and this treasury is at the disposal of the Church. She draws upon it for the remission of the temporal punishment of its members much the same way as a man draws on his bank account to pay his debts!

**How many kinds of indulgences are there?**

There are two kinds of indulgences—plenary and partial.

**What is a plenary indulgence?**

A plenary indulgence is understood to be so granted that if a person should be unable to gain it fully, he will nevertheless gain it partially in keeping with the disposition that he has. A plenary indulgenee, unless it be otherwise expressly stated, can be gained only once a day even though the prescribed worship be performed several times. The conditions ordinarily prescribed for gaining the plenary indulgence and designated by the familiar phrase, "under the usual conditions" are the following: Confession, Communion, visit to a church or public oratory and even a semi-public oratory in certain cases and a prayer for the Supreme Pontiff. The following are several examples of plenary indulgences that can be gained by all faithful :

Those who piously recite a third part of the Rosary and in the presence of the Blessed Sacrament, may gain a plenary indulgence on condition of Confession and Communion.

The faithful who with at least a contrite heart whether singly or in company, perform the pious exercise of the Way of the Cross when the latter has been legitimately erected according to the prescription of the Holy See (Pope), may gain a plenary indulgence as they perform the same. The faithful who devoutly recite the prayer, "Behold O good and sweetest Jesus," before an image of Jesus Christ crucified may gain a plenary indulgence under the usual conditions.

**What is a partial indulgence?**

A partial indulgence is the remission of part of the temporal punishment due to our sins. God alone knows exactly how much of the temporal punishment is actually taken away by an indulgence. The following are some ejaculations and invocations to which partial indulgences are attached ;

An indulgence of 300 days for saying the ejaculation : "Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of hosts; the heavens and earth are full of Thy glory!"

An indulgence of 300 days for saying the ejaculation : "My God and my All!"

Indulgence of 500 days for saying the ejaculation: "Oh God be merciful to me, a sinner."

An indulgence of 300 days, a plenary indulgence under the usual conditions if this invocation is devoutly recited every day for a month: "My Jesus, mercy!"

An indulgence of 300 days, a plenary indulgence once a month, on the usual conditions if this invocation is devoutly repeated daily: "O Mary, conceived without sin, pray for us who have recourse to thee!".

> **What is the superabundant satisfaction of the Blessed Virgin Mary and the saints?**
>
> The superabundant satisfaction of the Blessed Virgin Mary and of the saints is that which they gained during their lifetimes but did not need and which the Church applies to their fellow members of the communion of saints.*

Thus the stage is set for limitless moral corruption and association of other men with God to the point which practically results in polytheism. The association of partners with God (*Shirk*) is the most reprehensible of all sins in the eyes of God. In the Holy Quran and Hadith, God promises to forgive all sins expect *Shirk*, because this is open rebellion against the absolute sovereignty and unity of God. Islam teacnes that only God can forgive our sins; each sinner must repent before God individually and beg pardon directly from Him; no priest and no saint, however holy, has the power to forgive a man's sins. The Holy Quran tells us that each is individually responsible for his deeds for which we each shall have to render a complete account before God on Judgment Day. The Holy Quran teaches that no laden one can bear another's burden. This is the most eloquent refutation of the Roman Catholic sacrament of confession of one's sins before a priest and the doctrine of indulgences.

The Protestant Reformation in Europe was the inevitable reaction against the corruption and tyranny of the Roman Catholic Church :

> It was held that the Pope possessed a treasury of

**Understanding the Catholic Faith*, op. cit., pp. 240-244.

superfluous merits accumulated by the saints and that he had unlimited dispensation of these credits. "Indulgences" were sold in the form of documents transferring these credits to the purchaser's spiritual debit. The English priest, John Wycliff, condemned papal taxation as greed and the doctrine of transubstantiation as unscriptural. Wyclif influenced John Huss in Bohemia to lead a popular religious revolt of such proportions that the Council of Constance in 1415 condemned Huss to be burned at the stake. A quite unrelated reform later in the 15th century was led by the Dominican monk, Savonarola, in the city of Florence which procured for him finally only his own death by hanging. In vain, the Church at large attempted through the co-operation of bishops, kings, emperors and by the councils called at Constance and at Basle in the first half of the 15th century. to introduce needed reforms in church life and administration. The Protestant Reformation split western Christianity into two irreconcilable groups. The Church seemed to the layman corrupt. The Church had been identified in his mind with a vast system of financial exactions, rapaciously, draining gold from every corner of Europe to Rome where luxury, materialism, irreverence and even harlotry seemed to reign unchecked among the clergy. All that was lacking was a leader who should precipitate the needed reforms. In Germany such a man appeared. He was Martin Luther (1488-1546), an honest, impetuous heavy-set German. When the members of his Wittenberg congregation (he preached in the castle church besides teaching at the university) went to buy these indulgences, he spoke out against their doing so. Urged by his friends who felt as he did, on October 31, 1517 he posted on the door of the castle church the famous "Ninety-Five Thesis"—a detailed attack on the selling of indulgences drawn up in the form of propositions for public discussion. Luther's examination of the Bible convinced him that the Catholic Church had departed so far from its scriptural basis that many of its practices were actually anti-Christian. The Pope issued a

bull of condemnation against Luther. The Emperor, Charles V, being called upon to act, Luther was summoned in 1521 to appear before the imperial diet meeting at Worms. The elector of Saxony consented to this only if Luther were promised safe conduct which, being assured, Luther appeared. He readily acknowledged that the writings issued under his name were his, but would not retract, he said, unless he should be convinced from Scripture that he was in error. The edict therefore put him under a ban, ordered him to surrender and forbade anyone to shelter him or read his books. But Luther could not be found; his prince, the elector Frederick of Saxony, had him seized on the way home and he was hidden away in the Wartburg Castle. Luther used his enforced leisure to good purpose. He translated the Bible into German—an ephocal achievement in more than one sense. It carried out the Reformation principle that the Bible must be put into the national language through which national unity could be achieved. "The Edict of Worms" was never enforced. When Luther emerged from hiding, the emperor was busy with wars and quarrels and, moreover, it was apparent that the German people were largely on Luther's side. Whole provinces became Protestant at one stroke when their princes renounced allegiance to the Pope and turned Lutheran. By the time of Luther's death in 1546 his reforms had spread from central Germany into much of southern and all northern Germany and beyond into Denmark, Norway, Sweden and the Baltic States. Luther disappointed many by siding with the princes during the peasant revolt in 1524. In fact, he laid the basis of German statism by commanding submissive obedience to government authorities on the part of all Lutherans.

A more radical Reformation came in Switzerland when Ulrich Zwingli (1484-1531), a highly educated parish priest whose sympathies lay from youth with the Humanists, especially in their war on superstition and irrationalism, advocated a return to the New Testament as the basic

source of Christian truth. In Zurich, therefore, he began a systematic public exposition of the books of the Bible begining with the Gospels. By 1522, he reached the conviction that Christians are bound by and should practice only what is commanded in the Bible—a far more radical position than that of Luther who held that Christians need not give up the elements in Catholic practice which are not forbidden in the Bible. The Zwinglian Reformation spread in his lifetime to Basle, Berne, Glarus, Mulhausen and Strassburg. Ultimately it produced civil war between Catholic and Reformed forces and Zwingli fell in one of the battles in 1531.

In Switzerland, an intense young preaeher called Farel, won Geneva over to the Reformation. The task of producing a thoroughgoing religious reform proved so difficult that he prevailed upon a young French scholar, John Calvin (1509-1564), to stay and help him. Calvin was at the time (1536) in flight from France where he published at the age of 26 the first edition of the Reformation classic—"*The Institutes of the Christian Religion*"—a crystal clear definition of the Protestant position which was destined to lay the foundations of Presbyterianism.

The uninhibited Henry VIII, in the grip of a personal desire for a change in his marital status, vowed that if the Roman Curia would not annull his marriage to Catherine of Aragon in order that he might marry Ann Boleyn, he would break with the Pope. The Roman Curia turned him down and Henry did not hesitate to act. But Henry VIII was theologically conservative; he did not intend that there should be a doctrinal break with the past to match his jurisdictional break with the Pope. The only concession Henry made to liberal views, aside from his break with Rome, was having a copy of the Bible in English placed in all the churches.*

**Islam and its Contemporary Faiths*, Mahmud Brelvi, op. cit., pp. 1?8-194.

The Protestant Reformation led to an unprecedented bloody conflict with the monarchs who still remained loyal to Roman Catholicism. Meanwhile the Catholic Inquisition was kept busy torturing "heretics" to death and the burning of "forbidden books." The conflict between the Protestants and Catholics convulsed Europe in bloodshed for more than a century and a half. What was its result?

The rebellion of the leaders of the Reformation against the authority of the Pope, the elimination of the priestly hierarchy, saint-worship, the use of images for worship, some of the sacraments and the abolition of monasticism have tempted some modernist Muslim thinkers to regard Protestanism as proof that Christianity is evolving closer to Islam. A more careful examination, however, will show how unjustified such optimism is. The substitution of the authority of the Church for the authoriy of the scriptures gave every individual the license to interpret the Bible exactly as he wished, choosing and discarding according to whim, convenience and circumstance. Rejecting Latin as the universal language of the Church, Protestant leaders translated the Bible into the local vernaculars, thus subjecting it to even more corruption. The rejection of the authority of the Pope and the Latin language greatly strengthened the cause of secular nationalism. In all Protestant countries a separate national church was organized under the complete control of the government until everywhere in Europe, the spiritual power of religion was compelled to submit to the expediency of secular politics.

The Church of England is perhaps the most obvious example of a religion which is not a religion in any real sense of the word. Partly that applies to all organized Protestantism but the Church of England has probably gone further because it has long been a State political department. In British India, for example, the Church of England was almost indistinguishable from the Government. The officially paid (out of State revenues) priests and chaplains were the symbols of British imperial power just as the other civil services.

From the highest ethical standards, the Church of England has sought to justify British predatory policy in Asia and Africa and given that extraordinary feeling of being always in the right to the English. The brand of "religion" which the Church of England has adopted has certainly blunted British moral susceptibilities where their own interests were concerned. Other peoples and nations have often behaved far worse than the British have done but they have never succeeded quite to the same extent in making a virtue of what profited them.

Protestantism tried to adapt itself to new conditions and wanted to have the best of both worlds. It suceeded remarkably so far as the world was concerned but from the spiritual point of view, religion gradually gave place to sentimentality and big business.*

From the point of view of doctrine, the Protestant Reformation does not show any signs that Christianity is moving closer to Islamic teachings. Protestants (except for a few sects like Quakerism and Unitarianism) accept, as uncritically as Catholics, the dogma of the Trinity, the Incarnation of God into Christ, Original Sin and the vicarious atonement of the sins of mankind by his alleged crucifixion.

**Towards Freedom*: *the Autobiography of Jawaharlal Nehru*, Beacon Press, Boston, 1958, pp. 241-242.

All of these unfortunate developments, fostered and encouraged by the Reformation, were merely a foretaste of the age of atheism and materialism that has characterized modern Western civilization ever since.

Western culture had its origin among a people who were were not blessed with any clear and pure source of divine wisdom. They had their leaders of religion, no doubt, but these divines were not endowed with wisdom or knowledge or armed with any law of divine origin. They had no assets or equipment except a fallacious religious concept which was inherently incapable of guiding them along the right lines. On the other hand, it could not but act as an obstacle to the progress of science and Philosophy. This is precisely what it did with the result that those who were eager to progress threw religion overboard and adopted a different course where they had no guide except observation, experience, speculation and deduction. With the help of these guides they no doubt made appreciable endeavours in the spheres of thought, research and organization but in every one of the field in which they worked, they made a wrong start and set out in the wrong direction. The partial policies as well as the theory of this culture are based upon perverse and unstable foundations. Its philosophy and science, its ethical values and social system, its law and politics, in short, every feature of this culture started from the premise of atheism and materialism, and consequently looked upon the universe as an object without a Creator or Master. Similarly, they studied the phenomena of nature and the living creatures with the presumption that there was no reality beyond what could be directly perceived or experienced. With the help of experience and speculation, they studied and comprehended the law of nature but they could not perceive its Maker. They found the world of matter at their feet and they began to press its forces into their service. But they had no idea

> that they were not the masters or rulers of this world in their own right but only the vicegerents of the real sovereign. This ignorance of and indifference to the divine Creator and Master of the Universe made the concept of responsibility alien to their minds. And, consequently, they raised the whole edifice of their civilization and culture on unsound and insecure foundations.*

What was the effect of this materialistic philosophy upon the Christian Church itself? We will now see that even the most outstanding Christian theologians have succumed to modernism with no effective resistance to combat it, for the Church never had any weapons save persecution and repression of "heretics" to fight with. When its temporal power was vanquished by the Protestant Reformation and the French Revolution, even its leading exponents became the champions of modernism. The first and foremost attack was on the Bible to prove by means of careful historical research and deductive reasoning that it was not Divine revelation but merely a man-made composite work by various authors written by the scribes centuries after the deaths of the prophets and patriarchs. This kind of historical and literary research to prove that the Bible is not divine but man-made and only a product of its peculiar time and place is known as "Higher Criticism." These Christian modernists went further to deny the validity of the miracles and supernaturalism in the Bible as no better than irrational superstition unacceptable to the modern mind.

**The Sick Nations of the Modern Age*, Sayyid Abul Ala Maudoodi, Islamic Publications, Lahore, 1966, pp. 1-3.

Professor Loisy, formerly Abbe Alfred Loisy, is the most outstanding representative of Modernism in France. Second to none in the authority derived from learning, he had been ranked for the greater part of his life as one of the foremost theologians of the Catholic Church. He devoted nearly thirty years of his life to the problems connected with Biblical criticism and his work in that field is a masterpiece of erudiction and scholarship. The research was undertaken in a spirit of defending the Orthodox position against the adversely disposed Biblical critics but ended in a total rejection of Orthodoxy. The Vatican subsequently turned him out of the Roman communion and he became a lay professor. Loisy's final conclusions regarding Christianity which he bases on the textual criticism of the Bible are both Interesting and instructive. He regards the Biblical Jesus as 'the last of a series of Jewish Messianic agitators as, for instance, Judas the Galilean and the prophet Theudas. Somewhere between the years 26 and 36 of the Christian era, Jesus began to proclaim the coming of God. After preaching for a while in Galilee where he enlisted only a few followers, he came to Jerusalem for Easter and there all he succeeded in accomplishing was to get condemend to death on the cross like any common criminal by the prosecutor, Pontius Pilate. For Loisy, the greater part of the Passion story on which the superstructure of Christianity has been built is mythological. "The Gospels do not relate the death of Jesus. They relate the myth of salvation realized by his death, perpetuated in a way by the Christian Eucharist, emphatically commemorated and renewed by the Easter festival. The Christian myth was without doubt related to the other salvation myths. It is by no mere chance that the resurrection of Christ on the third day after his death concides with the ritual of the Feast of Adonis. As regards the Jesus legend taken as a whole, "There is no actual consistency in the Gospel story save the crucifixion of Jesus condemned by Pontius Pilate as a Messianic agitator." He thus sums up the final results of his Bibical researches,

"These fragments of biography of Jesus in the Gospels create no impression of reality. Direct criticism of Gospel legend shows the gradual growth of that naive, incoherent epic so frankly bold in its inventions which we know as the four Gospels. In the beginning, as few rather meagre recollections, arranged in the traditional manner and made to accord with the stlye of the Old Testament and then miracles of which the best that can be said is that they are in the taste of the age and that they probably resemble those attributed to Jesus in his lifetime or better still, that the majority, if not all, were understood as concrete symbols of the spiritual work of Jesus—many incidents intending to relieve the narrative, or more especially to fulfil prophecies or merely inserted with an apologetic intent ; the whole more or less coordinate with the ritual commemorating the Messianic Epiphany and salvation through Christ."*

"Whether the new interpretations of the articles of faith and dogmas of religion are true or not, one fact emerges clearly from the foregoing discussions, namely that **traditional Christianity—the Christianity of the Bible, of St. Paul and other Apostles, of the early Fathers of the Church and of the vast majority of Christians from the earliest times to the present day—cannot prove its bona fides and cannot therefore survive the scientific and historical criticism.** The Christian leaders are not conscious of it, but their inherited emotional attachment to the Church makes it impossible for them to see straight and solve the enigma directly. They catch hold of one subterfuge and when that fails, they manufacture another. The latest and probably the best attempt is that in which, while admitting the Pagan

**Islam and Christianity in the Modern World,* Muhammad Fazlur Rahman Ansari, op. cit., pp, 163-165.

antecedents of Christianity and the untrustworthy character of the Bible, a case is made out for Christianity by presenting it as the natural development and synthesis of the ancient mystery cults and philosophical creeds of Europe, particularly Hellenism, and thus appealing to the 'national' or 'racial' instinct of the European peoples. Christianity is thus made to appear as a purely European religion and is virtually aliehated from its Judaic and Semitic background. The fallacy of such a course is apparent but its authors attempt to overcome this inconsistency with the force of rhetoric. Reverend W. R. Inge has developed the theory fully and it will do well to quote him in detail. He says :

> The Christian Church was the last creative achievement of the classical culture. It is neither Asiatic nor medieval in its essential character. It is not Asiatic; Christianity is the least Oriental of all the great religions. *As a great historical institution, Christianity can be characterised as the religion of the white race.* The Semites either shook it off and reverted to a Judaism purged of its Hellenic elements or enrolled themselves with fervour under the banner of Islam. *Christian missions have had no success in any Asiatic country.* Nor is there anything specifically medieval about Catholicism. It preserved the idea of Roman imperialism after the secular empire of the West had disappeared and they kept the tradition of the secular empire alive. Nor were the early Christians so anxious, as is often supposed, to disclaim continuity with Hellenism. At first, it is true, their apologetic was directed to proving their continuity with Judaism but Judaism ceased to count for much after the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 and the second-century apologists' appeal for toleration on the ground that the best Greek philosophers taught very much the same as the Christians believe. 'We teach the same as the Greeks,' says Justin Martyr, 'though we alone are hated

for what we teach. The teachings of Plato, says Justin again, 'are not alien to those of Christ and the same is true of the Stoics.' St. Augustine says that only a few words and phrases need to be changed to bring Platonism into complete accord with Christianity. **There are few other examples in history of so great a difference between appearance and reality. Outwardly the continuity with Judaism seems to be unbroken and that with paganism to be broken. In reality, the opposite is the fact.** The truth is that the Church was half-Greek from the first, though I shall say presently, *the original Gospel was not.* St. Paul was a Jew of the dispersion, not of Palestine, and the Christianity to which he was converted was the Christianity of Stephen—not of James, the Lord's brother. His later epistles are steeped in the phraseology of the Greek mysteries. The Epistles to the Hebrews and the Fourth Gospel are unintelligible without some knowledge of Philo whose theology is more Greek than Jewish. Judaic Christianity was a local affair and had a very short life. Christianity at first sought its credentials in Judaism though the Jews saw very quickly that it destroyed their Law. The belief of the Protestant reformers was plausible for they rejected just those parts of Catholicism which had nothing to do with Palestine but were taken over from the old Hellenic culture. But the residium was less Jewish than Teutonic. On one side, indeed, the Reformation was a return to Hellenism from Romanism. The revolt was against Latin theocracy and the hereditary paganism of the Mediterranean peoples. It was not really a return to pre-Hellenic Christianity. In conclusion, what has the religion of the Greeks to teach us that we are most in danger of forgetting? In other words it is a faith that truth is our friend and that the knowledge of truth is not beyond our reach. Faith in honest seeking of Truth is at the heart of the Greek view of life. It is the belief of the present writer that the unflinching eye and the open mind will bring us again to the feet of Christ whom Greece, with her long tradition of free and fearless inquiry, became a speedy and willing captive, bringing her manifold treasures to Him in the well-

> grounded confidence that he had not come to destroy but to fulfil. Organized religion is not in modern times one of the strongest forces in human affairs. The strength of Christianity is, like Platonic mysticism, in transforming the lives of a small minority of individuals. To rescue a little flock here and there from materialism, selfishness and hatred is the task of the Church of Christ in all ages alike and there is no likelihood that it will ever be otherwise.*

What a reduced and emasculated faith the Christian modernists preach which can scarcely appeal to anybody, much less the non-European peoples. This modernism inevitably leads to the following conclusion :

> Is God dead? It is a question that fascinates both believers who perhaps secretly fear that He is and atheists who suspect that the answer is no. Even within Christianity, now confidently renewing itself in spirit as well as form, a small band of radical theologians has seriously argued that the churches must accept the fact of God's death and get along without Him. Nietzsche's thesis was that striving self-centered man had killed God and that settled that. The current death of God group believes that God is indeed absolutely dead, but proposes to carry on and write a theology without Him. Less radical Christian thinkers hold that at the very least God is in the image of man; God sitting in Heaven is dead and in the central task of religion today, they seek to imagine and define a God who can touch men's emotions and engage men's minds. Princeton's theologian, Paul Ramsey, observes that "ours is the first attempt in recorded history to build a culture upon the premise that God is dead."*

**Islam and Christianity in the Modern World*, op. cit., pp. 171-174.

*"Is God Dead?" feature article of *Time Magazine*, Asia Edition, April 8, 1966.

In the Protestant Church the services consist mostly of responsive readings from the Bible followed by the singing of hymns both by the choir and the congregation. There is almost always an organist and sometimes a violinist to accompany them.

> The organist plays while the congregation makes its monetary offering. This continues the very old custom of bringing gifts to the altar as part of the worship of God. The sermon is more important in Protestant churches than in others. This is true because each person has greater freedom and more responsibility. There is no priest to tell him what he should think or do: there are no fixed religious customs to control his behaviour. So he needs more help so that he may understand the meaning of the Bible and of Christ's life and work and that he may want to share in all that is right and beautiful. After the sermon, a prayer and another hymn the minister pronounces the benediction—the beautiful words of Paul :
>
> "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God and the communion of the Holy Spirit be with you all."
>
> A moment of silent prayer and the service is over. Friendly chatting begins as the people leave their seats in the pews. The minister stands at the door to greet them. There is a general air of informality that is typically Protestant.*

Except possibly for the responsive readings from the Bible, one can see that the Protestant church service is entirely man-made and therefore nothing can stand as an obstacle, except perhaps personal taste, to change and innovation. In contrast, the *Salat* at the mosque follows the infallible and unchangeable *Sunnah* of the Prophet who condemned all innovation in matters of faith as tantamount to apostasy. Were the

**One God: the Ways we Worship Him*, Florence Mary Fitch, Lothrop Lee and Shephard, New York, 1945, pp. 123-124.

Holy Prophet to come back to earth, he would find the *Salat* at the mosque today exactly as it was during his lifetime. A Muslim from Indonesia could join in his *Salat* at a mosque in Morocco and feel thoroughly at home. Protestant churches conform their services to the national languages and customs of their particular environment; therefore no such bond of unity exists between them. Recently the movement for Christian unity has accelerated the modernization of all churches and compelled the Roman Catholic Church to abandon the use of Latin and radically changed its service to conform more and more closely to that of the Protestant churches. For some decades the vulgarity of modernism has been invading the precincts of the Church. In recent years this tendency has been greatly accelerated:

> "I don't know what has happened to the church I knew as a child," someone recently complained to me. "Everything has turned so modern—so jazzy." Surprisingly, this remark was not made by an elderly set-in-his-ways parishioner but by an attractive young girl who had just emerged from a student-led interfaith service. And while she was intrigued by the guitars, the informality and the activist exhortation, she also felt a bit threatened by it all. Many applaud these changes, calling them long overdue. But a considerable number are disturbed over such situations as the following:
>
> *In New York City, a clergyman is appointed spiritual advisor to jazz musicians. His involvement leads him from one night club to another. In San Francisco an Episcopal priest concentrates his ministry among the Hippies of the Haight-Ashbury district. Most members of his diocese are unperturbed, remembering other clerical innovations, such as the group of younger clergy who established pastoral counselling in the area's homosexual community and the

bishop who declared the doctrine of the Trinity to be a "heavy piece of luggage."

*In Cambridge Mass. a theologian recommends that the word "God" be given a moratorium. A Dallas professor of theology argues that the Christian faith today must be understood within the context of an evolutionary picture of the world.

*In Washington D.C. jazz music resounds from the sanctuary of the prestigious National Cathedral while in a staid old Boston church, teen-agers dance the *frug* in the aisles during a service of worship.*

The tidal-wave of modernism is destroying at an unprecedented rate the entire foundation of the Roman Catholic Church as can be demonstrated in the alarming decline in the appeal of the priesthood and the monastery for the younger generation:

> The stereotype is familiar: the traditional nun in starched cuff, black veil and long robe, hands piously holding the crucifix at her bosom, eyes downcast humbly as she walks the austere corridor of her convent. That nun—if indeed she ever existed outside of Hollywood's imagination—is gone. Today's sister is likely to wear a dark dress set off with a religious symbol such as a cross—or clothes that do not distinguish her in any way from a laywoman. Some still wear short veils; many do not. Today's nun may live in an ordinary flat rather than a parish convent. She may be a teacher, nurse, or social worker but she is more mobile, freer to participate in secular activities, more likely to use spare time for Apostalic work outside the parochial school or Catholic hospital. Emphasis on inviduality seems to vary with each community of Sisters but it appears to have flowered since Vatican II's call for renewal.

*"Are You distriburbed by the 'New Religion?" David A. Edman, *Reader's Digest*, March 1964, pp. 77-78.

Bishop John J. Ward, Vicar for the Los Angeles Archdioceses, thinks dissatisfaction with the rate of change is a principal reason for sisters leaving the convent. They say, "My community is not moving ahead fast enough." he said. Greater freedom—to think, to speak, to do—may result in women playing a greater role. The changes have brought varying reactions from the laity. One Catholic laywoman described herself as being "thoroughly disappointed." "I feel something traditional has been lost. There was something about the long robes and the rosary beads that clattered when they walked down the hall that meant something—a kind of respect. At our parochial school I was always in awe of the Sisters until they started wearing a short dress and half-veil. I no longer feel the difference between us—the nun and the lay person."

To some Sisters that is the point : to be accepted as a Christian by virtue of deeds, not apparel.

In 1966, 1,800 Roman Catholic sisters left the religious life in America, five times as many as in 1950. Three years later the official Catholic Directory showed a loss of more than 9,000 during 1969 alone !

Asked if she were still a Catholic, one ex-nun replied: "Yeah—on my own terms. If you mean, do I go to Mass on Sunday, no. I haven't been to Mass since Christmas."*

One intelligent Australian who was so disgusted with what he found in his Church that he embraced Islam writes:

The majority of Australians only pay lip-service to their religion. The churches on a Sunday are half-empty and therefore gymmics are sought and adopted to attract larger crowds. Special church services for Surfies, Rockers and Beatniks, pop music in church and the combination of two or more denominations. We even have a full-time beach

*"Nuns no More," Ursula Vils, as quoted from *The Light*, Lahore, February 8, 1971, pp. 5-6.

parson spreading the Gospel on the bathing beaches on a Sunday.*

"As the formidable and devastating anti-Christian flood rolls ahead, sweeping off Christianity in all countries, uneasiness, alarm and consternation spreads in Christian ranks. Official Christianity is throwing in its last reserves in an attempt to turn the tide. Desperate and exasperated, she is trying every means she can lay her hands upon, however disparaging they may otherwise be to the genuine spirit and teaching of the Bible. One group, consisting of the best brains among the clergy, is attempting to rationalise Christinity by weeding out all that is objectionable to the modern scientific view, which, though it may temporarily succeed in deceiving people, actually ends in the virtual negation of Christian verities and consequently meets with the condemnation of the more consistent and less enlightened section of priesthood. The other group resorts to reforming the techniques of church life and seems to think that by pandering to the tastes of the common mass, by transforming the churches into cinema halls and social clubs and by making the whole church business more business-like, they can arrest the progress of the anti-Christian forces. The editor of *The Boston Herald*, while expressing his nervousness at the inefficiency of the clergy, appealed to them to study the art of advertising so as to enable themselves to 'sell' Christianity better to the public. He said ;

*"Islam in Australia," Achmad M. Hienekamp, *The Minaret*, Karachi, March-April 1968, p. 3.

We do know that the advertising business is attracting many able young men because it is a growing business and increasingly influential. We hear that everything must be 'sold' these days. The President has to 'sell' his policies; the colleges have to 'sell' their instruction, art has to 'sell' its creations; not only do merchants have to sell their wares but some of the finest and cleanest philanthropic enterprises in the world are experts at advertising. Why not apply the same idea to the church sermon? Preaches must 'sweat blood' for the production of good sermons and sell them to the public.

The Reverend Griffin went a step further.

Griffin, Pastor of the Rogers Park Baptist Church, Hilldale and Greenleaf Avenues, exhibited five types of girls to his audience, His subject: 'The Kind of Girl to Marry.' Each of the young women stepped into a framework of flowers and tissue-paper lattice-paper which had been arranged in front of the Church over the Baptistry while a spotlight was turned on.

The Reverend Karl A. Glackman, Associate Minister of the Linwood Christian Church, Kansas City, Missouri reported:

I've got to get them some way ana my way seems to be right for they come in thousands to my Happy Sundays. At three in the afternoon we let down a screen across the top of the church and have moving pictures—the best moving pictures we can have for young children. Waifs and strays come into the church in hundreds. They make an awful mess in the church. Two bushel baskets of rubbish, popcorn, peanut husks, chewing gum and all sorts of things are carried away after these children have been there. And you have to get hold of those young people with your first sentence or they would soon leave the Church contented with having seen a good film. The lights are subdued a little so that boys and girls can behave as is natural to boys

and girls but I keep a fatherly eye on all of them. I have a quiet little room with a soft light and there I receive young people who have troubles to get off their chests and want advice. Some are girls who are a little faded and want to know why it is that men don't keep running after them like they do other girls. I cheer them up and tell them to put their clothes on better or advise of something that will bring their personality more to the front. Yes, sir, my methods are popular!*

The cheapness and vulgarity which characterizes the church services of some radical Protestant sects is fully revealed in a frank confession of none else than the famous Rock'n Roll entertainer, Elvis Presley (1935-1977). When questioned by a journalist about his early life, the late pop-singer replied:

"We were a religious family, constantly going around together to sing at camp revival meetings in the South. Since I was two years old, all I knew was the jazzy gospel songs. That music became such a part of my life that it was as natural to me as dancing. A perfect way to escape from the problems of daily life. *It was in the church where I first got the idea for the pelvic wriggle that was later to become my controversial trade-mark during all my musical shows.* During the singings of the gospel hymns at those revivalist meetings, the preachers would dance all over the place, even jumping up on the piano, swaying their hips every which way. The audience liked that. And I guess I learned a lot from them.**

Likewise the church councils in America and England go even so far as to condone the practice of pre-martial sex; college authorities in America and

**Islam and Christianity in the Modern World*, Fazlur Rahman Ansari, op. cit., pp. 120-135.

**"Elvis Presley: the King of Rock'n Roll," Bob Hart, *The Sun*, Lahore, October, 19, 1977.

Europe now take the most premissive attitude towards the promiscuous intermingling of young male and female students fully sanctioned by the church while a recent pronouncement states that "homosexuality can be more fulfilling than matriage,"* As a reaction to a television programme on the B.B.C. showing a man and woman having intercourse in bed, the British Quakers declared: "As Christians we have felt impelled to state without reservation that sexuality is a glorious gift from God!"**

> More than 900 clergymen and students gathered last week at Harvard Divinity School to ponder over the "new morality" and its significance for the Christian Church. They generally agreed that the "new morality" is a healthy advance as a genuine effort to take literally St. Paul's teaching 'that through Christ we are liberated from the Law.' 'Lists of can's and cannot's are meaningless', says Princeton's Paul Ramsey. Joseph Fletcher of the Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge asserted that no sexual relationship should be absolutely condemned by the church. The 'new morality' he said, would certainly approve of an Episcopal priest in New York City who provides contraceptives for a gang of delinquents he attempts to serve. The core proposition of the 'new morality' which is always good regardless of circumstances and that is neighborly concern and social responsibility which is a divine imperative. **In the "new morality" the ultimate criterion for right and wrong is not divine command but the individual's subjective perception of what is good for himself and his neighbor in each given situation.*****

*"The Changing Christian Views on Sex," A. R. Khaliq, *Muslim News International*, Karachi, November 1967, p. 34.

**"Frankness in the Air," *Time Magazine*, July, 28, 1967, p. 23,

****Time Magazine*, March 5, 1965, pp. 28-29.

A highly intelligent seventeen-year-old American girl interviewed for a *Saturday Evening Post* article, "Youth: the Cool Generation," for December 23, 1961, when asked why she never attended church, replied: **"The Christian Church today does not lead society but merely reflects its debased values."** Thus in this single sentence has she so eloquently summarized all the hypocrisy inherent in religious modernism.

Not all Christians have succumbed to modernism. Some of its leaders are still honest enough to recognize its inherent fallacies:

Thus Reverend Dr. Mansell, formerly Dean of St. Paul's Church observes:

> Many who would shrink with horror from the idea of rejecting Christ altogether will yet speak and act as if they were at liberty to set up for themselves an eelectic Christianity, separating the essential from the superfluous portion's of Christ teaching and deciding for themselves how much is temporary and designed only for a particular age and people. Yet if Christ means God manifest in the flesh, it is surely not less impious to attempt to improve His teachings than to reject them altogether. Nay, in one respect it is more so, for it is to acknowledge a doctrine as the revelation from God and at the same time to proclaim that it is inferior to the wisdom of man.*

This argument is irrefutable. However, the learned elergyman overlooks the fact that Christianity from St. Paul onwards has been purely a man-made religion from its inception. In rejecting

*_Islam and Christianity in the Modern World_ op. cit., p. 176.

the Law on principle, Christianity has no place for the sacred Shariah and therefore in contrast to Islam, it gives no comprehensive Divine Guidance for life in all its aspects. As Christianity accepted the innovations from the pagan past, so must it now tolerate with utmost permissiveness the inroads of present-day atheism.

The first to lose interest and even faith in Christian dogmas were the Protestants, who were never as fervently orthodox as the Roman Catholics. But now it seems that even the Roman Catholics are losing faith. This is shown in the internationally famous weekly, TIME MAGAZINE, dated May 24, 1976. Its cover announces in bold letters "U. S. Catholicism—A Church Divided" And amazingly, the Cross is shown split into two! The cover story opens with the remarks of an ederly lady: "I hope to die soon so that I can die a Catholic." A few other excerpts are given below :

> Roman Catholic! The very words themselves are redolent of rich and solemn rituals chanted amid clouds of incense and in an ancient tongue. Many Amercian Catholics over 30 remember living in that history—the Church was a living spiritual fortress, comforting at times, inhibiting and even terrifying at others. But it was a safe and ordered universe with eternal guarantees for these who lived by its rules. The fortress has crumbled. Before the Second Vatican Council in 1962, the U. S. Catholic Church had seemed at least to outsiders to be a monolith of faith, not only the church's richest province but arguably, its most pious. When the Council ended in 1965, American Catholicism had been swept by a turbulent new mood, a mood of opened windows, tumbled walls, broken chains. It

became a painful experience for many, and over the next decade, the casualties were heavy; nuns leaving their convents, priests their ministries, lay Catholics simply walking away from worship and belief. The annual Official Catholic Directories have been carrying the statistics of decline throughout the decade. The figures show that about 3,100 Catholic elementary and high schools out of 13,340 have closed in the past ten years and enrolment has dropped from 5.6 million in 1965 to 3.5 million in 1975. Some 35,000 Amercian nuns and 10,000 priests, including a brilliant bishop, left their ministries and sometimes even the Church in a great exodus. There are fewer new priests to replace those who left. Seminary enrolment at a high of nearly 49,000 in 1954 fell to a low of 17,200 in 1975.

What is the future of the U. S. Roman Catholic Church? Jesuit sociologist, John Thomas, is pessimistic about an end to the drift from away from it. "Some like to call this a "Second Spring," he observes. "But I see it as an Indian summer which comes just before winter." Biblical scholar John A. Miles writing in *Theology Today*, sees the Catholics caught in a dilemna. He says; "If the church does try to exert some kind of authority, chances are it will only cause rebellion, further turmoil and shrinkage. If it does not, it may remain officially large but steadily weaker and more diffuse."

Christianity and Western civilization have been inseparable from each other ever since the time of St. Paul. Says Dean Inge in his essay. "Modernism in Religion".

The greatest of all crises through which Christianity passed was its transplantation into the soil of European culture which was the work of St. Paul's life. The Church then made its choice: it gained Europe and lost Asia. Compared with this momentous development, even the

Protestant Reformation was of secondary importance*

The Christians of the Western Asia and North Africa very quickly embraced Islam and never presented any serious opposition. Almost all the hostility and resistance to the spread of Islam emanated from Europe, for *Western civilization has never encountered any other significant rival.* Since the interests of Islam and Western civilization have always conflicted with each other, Orientalists criticize Islam much more harshly than religions like Hinduism or Buddhism which the Westerner can safely regard as merely exotic cults of the mystic East. We must now understand in detail the reasons for the hostility of the Christian West towards Islam and the Muslims.

> The existence of Islam made the West profoundly uneasy. On the practical plane, it caused permanent unease not only because it was a danger but because the danger was unpredictable and immeasurable; the West had no access to the counsels or motives of Islam. But this factor was only an indication of a deeper incomprehension of the nature of the problcm itself. In understanding Islam, the West could get no help ftom antiquity and no comfort from the present. Intellectually the nearest parallel to Islam was the position of the Jews. They shared many of the same tenets and brought foward many of the same objections to Christianity. But Christian thinkers had at their disposal an embarassing wealth of material for answering the Jewish case and the economic and social inferiority of the Jews encouraged the view that their case could be treated with disdain. Nothing is easier than to brush aside the

**Islam and the ·Christianity in the Modern World*, op. cit., pp. 111.

asguments of the socially unsuccessful, and we can see this verified in the melancholy history of the Jewish controversy in the Middle Ages. The same mixture of social superiority with a long tradition of authoritative refutation was responsible for the confidence with which the medieval Church faced the many heresies which arose in Europe from the eleventh century onwards. Even the schism with the Greek Orthodox Church could be pressed into this mold; worldly decline and priestly authority combined to lend each other mutual support. But Islam obstinately resisted that treatment. It was immensely successful. Every period of incipient breakdown was succeeded by a period of astonishing and menacing growth. Islam resisted both conquest and conversion and it refused to wither away. There were times when it seemed plausible to write off the whole scheme as the fantastic product of an evil imagination. No doubt this type of explanation would have gained wide currency if Islam had shown permanent signs of decline. Moreover, the Muslim system of thought had the adherence of men whom the West learned increasingly and sometimes extravagantly to admire—scholars, philosophers and scientists like al-Farabi, Ibn Sina and Ibn Rushd and heroes like Salah-ud-din Ayubi. It was hard to believe in the simple-minded delusion of such men.*

As the only other vigorous, dynamic and missionory faith which seeks to convert all mankind, there is no religion that presents itself as a serious rival to Christian missionary activity except Islam. Hence the Christian missionary naturally regards Islam as a unique problem :

"Islam is the only one of the great religions to come after Christianity; the only one that definitely claims to correct, complete and supersede Christianity; the only one that categorically denies the truth of Christianity; the only one

**Western Views of Islam in the Middle Ages*, op. cit., pp. 4-7.

that has in the past signally defeated Christianity; the only one that seriously disputes the world with Christianity; the only one which, in several parts of the world, is today forestalling and gaining on Christianity." These words, taken from a recent summary of the problem and the reproach of Islam, sum up the main reason why Islam is a unique problem to the Christian Church—unique in its urgency, unique in its difficulty. It cannot be treated like any other. It baffles more than any other for it is more difficult to concede to it what is gladly conceded to other religions appearing before Christ; that they in some sort prepared the way for Him. How can that which denies the whole content of His message be said to prepare for Him or to be a half-way house to His Kingdom? For that is what Islam does. Other religions know nothing of Christianity; one and all they came before it and speak of it neither good nor evil. But the whole theory of Islam is that it is the latest sent of all religions, does not so much abrogate Christianity with its Book as specifically and categorically deny it both as wilful corruption and lies. Point by point each truth of Christianity, steeped through and through with the tenderness of the love of God, is negated with abhorrence by Islam—the Fatherhood of God, the Sonship and Incarnation of Jesus Christ, the Holy Ghost, the death of Christ and all that it means whether ethically of love, infinite tenderness, infinite self-sacrifice or spiritually, of sin condemned and sin forgiven, the Resurrection of Christ on the third day and His glorification with the Father-each of these truths is a blasphemy in the eyes of every Muslim, a lie which Islam came expressly to blast, taught by a Book which the Quran came expressly to replace. It is easier to convince a man that of which he knows nothing in particular than that which he firmly believes to be definitely false. Add to this that Islam actually succeeded in displacing, humbling and destroying that which bore the name of Christianity in many lands and so Muslims became yet further convinced of the weakness and ignorance of Christians and of their disfavour with God. The rise of

the Christian nations has done nothing to dispel this for Islam credits that to anything but their religion. It therefore burns with a two-fold desire to revenge its own humiliation on the unbelieving nations whose yoke is on its neck and to vindicate its own still unfulfilled claims to universa ity and supreme victory. With the possible exception of Buddhism, *no other great non-Christian religion seriously cares whether it becomes universal or not.* Some, indeed, like Judaism and Hinduism, expressly repudiate universality. Islam alone claims it and actively and ceaselessly works to make good its claim. Back to that church-mosque at Damascus whence we took our start! See where a Cross once stood and where there stands a Crescent today! That sight stands for and typifies what every Muslim sees inwardly and believes he has the right to see actually when he looks at the Cross on every continental cathedral spire, every English minister rising from the pulpit, every village church from whose belfry tower chimes come like a benediction over the hamlet nesting at its feet and the meadow-lands smilng in the sunlight beyond. We have to remember that the Muslim knows his religion arose in the full light of day and rests on the undoubted historic fact of Muhammad, the Arabian Prophet who was given a Book from Heaven, the authenticity of which none denies. Nor is that all or nearly all. Add to this, the simplicity of the creed to which the Muslim invites the world's adherence. Islam simplifies with a vengeance! "There is no God but Allah and Muhammad is the Apostle of Allah"—a child can learn it in a moment and to its vigorous, negative exclusion and simple universal assertion, it seems to require no explaining, no elaboration; it can never be forgotten. The Muslim has little demand made on his intellect as on his moral faculty; his is the ideal religion for the "plain man."*

**The Reproach of Islam,* W. H. T. Gairdner, The Foreign Mission Committee of the Church of Scotland, Edinburgh, 1909, pp. 310-315.

Whatever success the Christian missionary has enjoyed in the de-Islamizing of Muslims both in lands where they constitute the majority such as Indonesia and Pakistan and where they are in the minority as in the Philippines, has been due to the political, military, economic and cultural domination of the West over the non-Western world. If anybody doubts the intimate relationship between the Christian missionary enterprise and Western imperialisms, he need only read the following testimony from one of its leading spokesmen at the beginning of this century :

> The Muslim world has been penetrated by Western travellers to its innermost recesses. Mecca and Medina as well as Kerbela and Meshed have laid bare their secrets. Arabia is being influenced as never before, by the forces of Western commerce and trade. The twentieth country with rail and steamer, is piercing and crossing the last remaining banks and soon Arabia, that great eddy in the stream of the world's progress, will find itself being rapidly carried along to the consummation of God's purpose. Socially the forces at work are those acting on all the world. We have here only space to note the growing tendency to approve, and without doubt soon to use, customs of distinctively Christian origin. Monogamy, equality of the sexes, schools for girls and various so-called handmaids of Christianity are beginning to be pressed into the service of Islam. Many of us think that it will result in a house divided against itself but only time will tell. Since these lines were written, Great Britain has occupied Basra and is about to make the Euphrates-Tigris valley another Egypt under some new Lord Cromer. Tripoli has seen more changes in the last five years than in the previous two hundred years. Whether we consider Italy's action in Libya brigandage on a national scale or legitimate colonial expansion, the fact remains that they have already estab-

lished communications, roads, telegraphs, railways, motor services; they are presently preparing the people for taking a share in their own development by instituting technical colleges; they have improved the water supply and the drainage and by these means the hospitals and medical service which they have introduced, they have already done much towards the stamping out or, at any rate, reducing certain diseases which have devastated the Arabs. The editor of *The Mussalman*, Calcutta, in speaking of the entrance of Russia and Great Britain into Persia, said that the loss of Persia would be a great calamity for the Muslim world. Afghanistan would be exposed to foreign invasion ; Arabia and the regions west of Persia would be similarly exposed ; thus the one loss may be the forerunner of many other great losses and the cause of utter annihilation of Islamic civilization. His words are finding fulfilment even as we write these lines, and it is doubtful whether after the Great European War, any Muslim land will retain even nominal independence. In addition to this political upheaval and parallel with it, a remarkable modernist movement has arisen and is gaining strength in Muslim lands all the way from Morocco to China. The introduction of Western customs, the multiplication of machinery and other devices of Western civilization, the increase of educational opportunities and especially the rise and enormous expansion of the Muslim press in imitation of its Western models have utterly changed many old standards and developed new social and intellectual ideals. European fashions of dress are being copied and Muslim boys in Turkey, Algeria and Java are gradually abandoning their national dress and adopting that of Europeans. The question of ceremonial washing before prayer is greatly complicated when children and grown ups use Western footwear and when watches and almanacs keep Western time and even children are asking what is the sigificance of A.D. 1915? Where European governments are establishing a school system, the missionary finds therein his vantage ground

for familiarizing the intelligent and influential section of the people with the doctrines and ideals of the Christian religion and that of the Government which, indifferent alike to the motives of the misssionary and the opposition of the mullahs, requires educated young men for administrative posts and believes that education eclipses fanaticism. (pp. 240-246), If the evangelization of Moslem childhood is part of the plan of God—and no thoughtful Christian man or woman can for a moment doubt this—**there was never a time when this task was more urgent and more possible than it is today.** As the Quran itself says: "Every nation has its appointed term and when that appointed times comes, they cannot hold it back an hour." There is no part of the whole world that has seen more stupendous changes—political and social—within the last two years than has South-East Europe, North Africa and Western Asia. Politically, Islam has lost its power throughout the whole of Africa, the whole of Europe, and is losing its grip even on Asia. Where formerly all evangelistic effort carried on directly for Moslems was interdicted or suppressed by the jealousy of Moslem governors and rulers, **today Islam has lost its sword and the very disasters which have overtaken its rulers, have chastened and subdued the hearts of Moslems everywhere.** The Great European War (1914-1918) with all its horrors have nevertheless helped to this end. The whole of North Africa has passed under European Government. This means settled administration, modern education and the inevitable breakdown of Moslem opposition. All the conditions emphasize that this is the best time for large effort. It was the conviction of a representative gathering of missionaries recently held in Egypt that "God is calling us to special effort on behalf of the Moslems by doors of opportunity which His providence has opened up, and by an era of responsiveness which has been ushered in through the manifest operations of His Holy Spirit. Today, as never before, there is manifest among Muslims, an interest in Christianity and its teaching."

(pp. 266-267).*

Here the policy of the Christian missionaries is laid bare, which proves that their enterprise aims for nothing less than:

1. The expansion of Western political, military, economic and cultural imperialism.

2. The total westernization of the Muslim countries.

3. The loss of the political, economic and cultural independence of all Muslim territories.

4. The utter annihilation of Islam and the Islamic way of life from the world.

In view of these subversive activities, how can any self-respecting Muslim country allow the missionaries to work unhampered as they are now given free reign under the guise of "liberalism" and "tolerance" in such vital areas as Indonesia, Nigeria and Pakistan? Under what amounts to Government patronage, the Christian missionaries through their schools, colleges and hospitals are reaping striking success.

What is the policy of the Christian missionary? How does he work and what are his methods ? Let one of them speak for himself :

> "I beg to lay before you the following proposals with regard to an organised effort to combat the advance of Islam in West Africa and in Nigeria especially. As ignorance is the greatest stronghold of Mohammedanism, so education is the Church's greatest weapon in meeting it.

**Childhood in the Moslem World*, Samuel M. Zwemer, Fleming H. Revell Co., New York, 1915.

1. Beginning with literature, efforts should be made to produce vernacular books dealing with the Mohammedan controversy. There is a large amount of such material already published in India and in Egypt. Gradually these could be transtated into the different vernaculars and thus the weapons already forged in warfare against Islam elsewhere would at once become available in West Africa.

2. In all Christian missionary schools, definite instruction should be given on the errors of Islam and the pupils forearmed. As Mohammedanism claims to be a larger revelation and to supersede Christianity, it is imperative that this bold challenge should be met and not passed over in silence and that every mission pupil should learn not only the Christian truths but also their position with regared to the Islamic attack on those truths.

3. Every effort should be made to encourage the systematic study of this question by all workers, both clergy and layman, as too often they are not well-equipped to meet the current objections to Christianity put into the minds of their hearers who may at any time become convinced.

4. Evangelistic effort ought to be more used among Mohammedans. Special meetings ought to be held for Mohammedans and every means tried to find out what sort of address or what form of gathering apeals to them. Preachers will need to be well trained for this work.

5. Special efforts should be made to occupy strong Mohammedan centres as it is for these places that the Mohammedan influence on the pagan districts is exercised.

6. An itinerant order of native preachers should go about, much the same way as Mohammedan *malams* travel from village to village, as a great means for extending the Kingdom. The men would need to be specially trained, and would then be given as free a hand as possible, travelling in a certain district and staying in the villages for a week or a month and endeavouring to get some place or building set apart for Christian worship. The

ordinary visit of the missionary too soon is forgotten while the itinerant mi ssionary, free to stay in the place for a month if need be, would be able to reap some of the fruit and leave a permanent instead of a transient impression. We should aim at placing a well-educated native teacher, catechist or minister wherever there is a Mohammedan village.

7. An attempt to plant colleges of trained Christian scholars in Mohammedanism in all great centres of population.

8. A series of books, the work of trained theologians and experts from the Mohammedan field, containing the best and soundest answers to all the usual Mohammedan objections and free from all unsound and defective arguments. These could be translated *ad lib*.

9. An appeal to men at home, the very best our universities have to give, to devote themselves to this work and to offer themselves where the battle is keenest and the call most urgent.*

Why has the missionary enterprise, despite the virtual monopoly it has held for nearly a century on educational and medical services in places like black Africa, not succeeded in these aims? The Christian apologist tries to argues as follows :

One must pause for a moment to consider the magnitude of the work the missionaries were undertaking. It was not only paganism they were attempting to displace but the Muslim faith as well and Islam was entrenched in Central Africa by this time (1870). It had strong attractions for the primitive tribesmen since it could be understood and practiced by the simplest mind. There was no complicated initiation, no elaborate ritual, not even priests or a church were required; one could worship alone or with the rest of the tribe. Already the Africans comprehended in a vague

**The Reproach of Islam*, op. cit., 284-288.

way the concept of God and Islam merely demanded of them that they should acknowledge the authority of the Prophet Muhammad. It was enough to declare "There is no God but God and Muhammad is His Prophet," and the pagan illiterate was accepted into a faith that offered him all kinds of advantages; he became a socially superior person inside his tribe; he was provided with a new code of living which did not greatly disturb his habits and which offered him the most dazzling pleasures after death. It is true that men had to undergo the operation of circumcision but that was not regarded as any great hardship; in fact, it was rather intriguing to the primitive mind and the other obligations of Islam were nothing very strange to a tribesman who was already living in a world of taboos and prohibitions. Compared to these easy-going doctrines, Christianity presented a hard and uncompromising front. Its emphasis upon Original Sin and its dogmas were difficult for a sluggish mind to master and its prohibition of slavery and polygamy seemed to the tribesman to be against nature. The ethereal Christian heaven had very little appeal when contrasted with the sensuous Muslim paradise and even the outward forms of Christianity were somewhat incongruous in this hot climate. The mosque had its graceful minarets and its great space beneath the rounded dome, its pleasant carpets to kneel on and it harmonized with the landscape. But the severe lines of Christian architecture were alien to Africa. Even the western (and therefore Christian) clothes the missionaries wore—the tight jackets and trousers—must have seemed absurd to the Africans when compared to their own seminudity or the cool and comfortable Arab gown.*

In other words, Christianity cannot appeal to the African or the Asian because it has always been identi-

**The White Nile*, Alan Moorehead, Dell Publishing Company, New York, 1960, pp. 311-313.

fied in his mind (and rightly so) as the white man's religion. Christianity, the notion of the superiority of the white race and its inseparability from the aims of European imperialisms are irrefutable when taken in the context of history. Some Christian missionaries have tried to argue that Christianity is a religion of Asia and not of Europe; that Jesus Christ lived all his life in Asia except as an infant when his mother took him to Egypt to escape the tyranny of King Herod. This apologetic ignores the fact that ever since St. Paul, the most powerful institutions of Christianity have always been in Europe and long before the historical onset of Islam, Christianity in what is now the Arab world and Turkey had grown very much enfeebled and never again regained its vigour. Thus Christianity has gone hand in hand with other aspects of European history, its missionary activities inseparable from the dominance of its imperialism over the non-Western world. It is rather late in the day to proclaim Christianity as a religion of Asia and Africa or attempt to disentangle it from the development of Western civilization.

In the passage on Christian missionary work in Africa just quoted, its propaganda tries to convince its audience that Islam is the champion of slavery and that the Christian missionary was responsible for stopping this reprehensible practice. This is the sort of propaganda the Christian missionary ceaselessly spreads all over Africa and elsewhere. Actually, the Christian scriptures contain hardly any explicit teachings regarding slavery except in the Epistles of St. Paul where it is commanded that the

slave be obedient and submissive to his master. Although the Gospel and the Epistles do grant the slave-convert to Christianity the right to enter the "Kingdom of Heaven" on an equal basis as his master, nothing is mentioned regarding his treatment during his earthly life. The attitude of the Church as late as two and a half centuries ago was well exemplified in a letter dated 1727 written by the Bishop of London to the slave owners of the southern colonies of America. He declared :

> Christianity and the embracing of the Gospel of Christ does not make the least alteration in Civil property or in any of the duties which belong to civil relation; but in all these respects, **it continues persons in the same state as it found them.** The freedom which Christianity gives is freedom from the bondage of sin and Satan and from the dominion of man's lusts and passions and inordinate desires; **but as to their outward condition; whatever that was before, whether bond or free, their being baptised and becoming Christian makes no manner of change in them,***

Of course today, no organized Church will express itself in this frank manner but essentially its attitude to property and the existing social order is the same.

In the Muslim countries, slavery did not necessarily mean the human degradation that it did in the "Christian" New World. Writes an English explorer visiting Arabia :

> Arabs have little, if any sense of colour bar. Socially they treat a slave, however black, as one of themselves. In the Hijaz, I was sitting in the audience chamber of an Amir who was a relative of King Ibn Saud when an expensively

**Moral Man and Immoral Society*, Reinhold Niebuhr, p. 78.

dressed old Negro belonging to the King entered the room. After rising to greet him, the Amir seated the slave beside him and served him his food with his own hands. Arabs raise slaves to positions of great power, often trusting them more than they do their own relations.*

The Holy Prophet told the master that his slave was his brother who must eat the same food he eats, wear the same quality of clothing that he wears and that he must not under any circumstances be beaten, or mistreated, or made to do any work beyond his strength. The Quran regards the liberation of slaves as one of the highest virtues, so much so that the freeing of a slave is the best expiation for many sins. The sacred Shariah gives the slave a definite legal status and specifically spells out his rights to humane treatment and the terms by which he can be freed. In the annals of Islamic history, we find slaves holding the highest positions of prestige and honor, including commander-in-chief of armies, slave-kings and indeed whole slave dynasties.

Muslim contributions to the development of Africa and African culture are many. Muslims refused to treat the African as an inferior but following the example of the Prophet (peace be upon him) extended to him the hand of brotherhood and equality. The poor example of a small number of Muslim slave-traders does not invalidate this. They were obviously following other than an Islamic example and were led by other than Islamic principles or motives. The overwhelming majority of Muslims refrained from such practices and in the true Islamic spirit, continued to emancipate people from slavery and to liberate colonized people

*_Arabian Sands_, Wilfred Thesiger, E. P. Dutton, New York, 1959, pp. 63-64.

from colonization. Africans mastered Arabic and some native African languages adopted Arabic terms and expressions, such as Hausa, Yoruba and Swahili. In providing a written language, a literate and learned administrative class and above all, a bond of union that cut across ethnic considerations, Islam was a powerful factor in nation-building in West Africa. Northern Nigeria had a well established system of government with laws and law courts and a financial administration based on Islamic law. African Muslims established international relations with the Islamic world, set up Islamic schools and colleges which gained wide fame. Youth from all over the Muslim world came to Timbuktu (Mali, West Africa) to study law and surgery at the University of Sankore; scholars came from North Africa and Europe to confer with the learned historians and writers of the black empire. Abd al Rahman al-Sa'adi, a Timbuktu intellectual who wrote a history of the Sudan in 1655, had a private library of 1,600 volumes. The University of Sankore and other intellectual centers in Timbuktu had a large and valuable collection of manuscripts in several languages. Scholars traveled to Songhay to check their Greek and Latin manuscripts. Ahmad Baba, born in Mali in 1556 composed many works on Islamic law and at least 13 of these are still in use by the ulama of West Africa. Another history of the western Sudan had been composed in Arabic by the Malian, Mahmud Kati who was born in 1468. This vigorous activity of Muslim scholarship and writing has never ceased in West Africa but has grown and spread with the passing of the years. The history of Islam in North Africa teems with examples of black rulers who achieved greatness in the opinion of contemporaries irrespective of colour or race. The history of Africa is full of examples of Sudanese jurists who attained the position of Imams, Qadis, and Muftis and whose books were known in the whole Muslim world.

Even in the issue where Islam is much maligned by Western writers—that of slavery—Islam played a positive role,

Because the goal of Islam is the emancipation of all men from the yokes of every type of servitude to other men, the Prophet and his companions liberated slaves and the Quràn commends the emancipation of slaves in six separate verses. The abuses which are characteristic of slavery did not exist even when circumstances called for Muslims to take captives of war. Whether the slaves of Muslims were white or black, the condition of servitude carried no racial stigma. Slavery was never rationalized in the Muslim world on the basis of innate biological inferiority and the laws of Islamic states made emancipation easy. Among the Muslims slavery never became a big business enterprise or the basis of the economy as in ancient Greece and Rome and the trade in slaves has always been held to be contrary to Islamic teaching. **By contrast, the *official documents* and pronouncements of the Church supported the slave trade.** Jesuits, Dominicans and Franciscans were heavily involved. The Moravian missionaries held slaves without hesitation; the Baptists would not allow their earlier missionaries to deprecate ownership of slaves. Slave dealing was one of the most lucrative investments of English as well as of American Quakers. It was not until the advent of European imperialism when the African slave trade reached massive proportions, decimating whole tribes. Also, the Europeans were qulck to formulate racial theories to justify the traffic, classifying Africans as "natural slaves" foredoomed to such a lowly state by their inborn backwardness.

The British abolished slavery in 1807 after it had become due to the industrial revolution, less profitable and less vital to England. Prior to 1783, however, all classes in English society presented a united front in favour of the slave trade. The monarchy, the church and public opinion in general supported it. Benjamin Disraeli, the Jewish-English Prime Minister elected in 1868, condemned the emancipation of slaves as "the greatest blunder ever committed by the English people."

Long before the emancipation of slaves in America in

1863, the Muslim governments of Futa Toro in Senegal West Africa abolished slavery by law in 1788 despite the fierce opposition of French slave traders. The French complained to the Imam, asking him to change his mind and do away with the law but the Imam refused and followed his refusal with a return to the slave agents of a number of presents they had given him, adding that all the riches of that company would not make him change his mind.

In fact, contrary to Christian missionary propaganda, Muslim Africans had for long participated in the suppression of the slave trade. The Sharif of Mecca had sent a letter to the king of the Fulahs for circulation through all the Mandingo tribes, strictly prohibiting the selling of slaves—and which letter was also promulgated among the Yorubas, Fulanis and other neighboring tribes. It declared the slave trade contrary to the teachings of Muhammad which pronounce "the most fearful denunciations of Allah's wrath in the world hereafter against those who persist in the traffic with European nations."*

One of the darkest chapters in the history of Christianity in Europe and America is the question of race-relations. Most Christian churches—both Catholic and Protestant, are rigidly segregated, and even when non-whites and whites attend the same church, they generally go to separate religious services. The worst feature of Christian missionary activity in Asia and Africa is that *even when the "coloured native"*, having been educated in missionary schools, *becomes thoroughly westernized and Christianized, he is never accepted by the European on equal social terms.* This racism is seen at its very worst in countries like South Africa:

The Dutch Reformed Church took the initiative in

* "Race, Racism and Islam," Sulayman Shahid, Mufassir, *Islam*, St. Louis, Missouri, July 1974, pp. 112-114.

December 1954 in calling a conference of Christian bodies to meet together to discuss the racial problems of South Africa. The hall in which the meeting took place was "zoned" so that the white and black delegates could not sit together. One African minister getting up to speak, prefaced his remarks by asking a question : "If our Lord Jesus Christ came into the room this morning, on which side would he sit ?" That question not is a bad way of stating the dilemma in which Christians find themselves in South Africa. Rather an over-simplified statement of the problem, perhaps, but the basically the problem all the same. And it is certainly not too soon for Christians the world over to know what is involved in it and why it is so vitally important to have some answer to it. In the first place, South Africa claims to be a Christian state. The leaders of the three branches of the Dutch Reformed Church have spent a great deal of time on debating whether apartheid is or is not consonant with Biblical teachings and authority. The average citizen who attends church knows that somehow by rationalisation or escape he has to answer the same question posed by St. Paul in another context: "Is Christ divided ?' It is my considered opinion that unless the Christian Church in South Africa really faces this issue honestly within the next generation or less, it may well lose-and deservedly, the allegiance of the African people. And it is also my opinion, and one which is not only unpopular with those outside the Anglican Church but also with those in authority within it, that the issue is not being honestly faced or properly presented to the conscience of the Christian world. The white Christian and the black profess the same allegiance to the same Lord. They recite the same creeds, receive the same sacraments and have the same worship. They no doubt use every day that prayer common to all Christians whose first words are "*Our* Father." But what of their relationship to one another in the city of Johannesburg where they live out their lives ? They can, it is true, pass one another in the street, and so share the

same air, the same shadows, the same blue sky. They can also meet together—master and servant—in a thousand different contexts; in kitchen, in factory, in office and in police court. This is contact. It is not relationship. It can never be love—the thing which Christianity is about. "Who is my neighbour? He is the man who makes my tea at ten o'clock and four and who brings it to me every day of my life in the office but he cannot sit at table and drink it with me. Who is my neighbour ? He is the child who comes to collect the washing on Mondays and to return it on Fridays ; the child who passes a recreation ground with swings and seesaws and cool green grass but who may not enter it because it labelled "For European Children Only." (pp. 59-61). The Episcopal synod of the Church of the Province of South Africa meeting in 1954 put forward a statement in which the bishops said, "It has been stated that because normally Europeans and Africans worship in different Church buildings is itself an acknowledgement of the principle of segregation. That is not so. Both linguistic and geographical reasons make it natural that normally Africans and European should worship in different places." In other words, there is no colour bar in the Church. Let us look at the facts. It is true, of course, that in any of the towns or cities, the African people will live in locations apart from their European masters. But it is also true that in every large town, there are thousands of African domestic servants who live where they work—in the back-yard rooms built on to every European house. These are also Christians. **But it is rare indeed for them to attend church at the same time as their employers.** Special services at an early hour in the morning are sometimes provided for them. They can meet together to worship the same God, to receive the same sacraments as the master and "missus" but not in the same service ! And even this custom can sometimes cause difficulty as it did when a young priest I know recently suggested to his church council that an "African" mass might be allowed at 5 : 30 A.M. once a month in his

church. Half the council resigned in protest. (pp. 75-76) The most disheartening thing about the Christian situation in this country is the absence of any deep sense of urgency. It is not that white Christians are bad ; very far from it. It is simply that they fail to see the relevance of their faith to social problems. Just as in the England of Wilberforce, there were Christians who defended slavery from the highest motives, so in South Africa there is an apathy and a patience within the Church towards the evil of racialism which is harder to bear and more difficult to break than any deliberate malice and wickedness. (p. 78). The Church is conniving at a policy which openly proclaims itself one of racial domination, of white supremacy, of "*basskap*" because it fears that any effective or determined opposition will lose it the allegiance of its white members. "Like a mighty army moves the Church of God!" we sing with gusto and emotion. We do not believe a word of it. And because we do not believe a word of it, African Christians will find it very hard indeed to justify their allegiance. (pp. 157-158)*

What is true in South Africa is the case (although perhaps to a less extreme degree) in regard to the churches in Europe and America. Now contrast the practice taken for granted in every mosque throughout the world:

Here on the floor of this mosque is a demonstration of the simplicity and the equality which run through the whole Islamic system inspite of any of its glaring contradictions and exceptions. Close by me is a group of *fellaheen* in their blue gowns and brown felt skull caps ; near these, a well-to-do young man in brown silk robe with fez and white turban, probably a native teacher in one of the primary schools ; here is a serving man from one of the

**Naught for your Comfort*, Trevor Huddleston, Collins, London, 1956.

neighbouring hotels in the white and scarlet waistband with his scarlet leather shoes by his side. This is no mosque, by the way, for the tourists and sightseers who leave their shoes with a guardian at the door and paddle about in slippers. We carry our shoes in with us and place them sole to sole beside us—to place mine with the soles on the carpet would have betrayed me as a non-Muslim. A young *effendi* comes in European dress except, of course, for the *tarboosh*, with his old-fashioned father in the black robe and turban. On the other side of me stands a poor labourer, fresh from the ablutions in the fountian court of the mosque, the water still dripping on the carpet from his head, hands and feet while his wet brown flesh shines in the lamplight. A rich man, whose silk robe is not kind to his portliness, enters with his servants and they make prayer side by side. Here is a poor old man to whom the attitudes and movements of the prayer have become difficult but who yet goes through his devotions with intense fervour and then sits with his hands as a cup upon his breast for a long time, muttering his private devotions, the "Amen" being to stroke the face downwards with the inside of the hands.*

Even the Western critic of Islam has to admit its success in solving the racial problem in contrast to Christianity:

> The extinction of race consciousness between Muslims is the outstanding achievement of Islam and in the contemporary world, there is a crying need for the propagation of this Islamic virtue.**

What kind of person is the typical Christian missionary from England or America ?

There was Miss Morphew (Isobel) but we never

**Veiled Mysteries of Egypt*, S. H. Leeder, London, 1912, pp. 116-117.

***Civilization on Trial*, A. J. Toynbee, New York, 1948 p. 205.

dropped the "Miss" with her home in Ramleh since the turn of the century. War came in 1914 and found her on forlough until she left England for Cairo to gather enough furniture for her Ramleh home which she knew would have but little left. It was all packed into a railway van and as soon as she could, she wrote to Lord Allenby asking that the wagon should be attached to one of the nightly trains running from Kantara into Palestine. Ramleh was already one of the stations on the old Jaffa-Jerusalem line, Lydda being the junction. Miss Morphew wanted to resume the work to which she had been called. It was said that General Allenby made enquiries via his staff and was advised to accede to Miss Morphew's request. She built another home in Ramleh, living with a Palestinian lady. They ran a school and the church was built through their endeavours. Though she never attended the Christian Mission School conference and but rarely visited Jerusalem, there was always a welcome in Ramleh alike for the unexpected and the casual. Miss Morphew gave the impression of knowing what she was going to do next. We never remember seeing her without a hat. Always an early riser, she would go round her garden soon after sunrise to gather the figs or other fruits in season. Then came work so she kept the hat on nearly all the day. The American and English army chaplains loved the little church ; it was possible for the soldiers to get out from Jaffa and even the window sills were occupied. Miss Morphew had her own Evangelist for the Arabic services. She knew whom or what she wanted. She loved Ramleh and its people and they her. It was well that she was taken before the tragedy of the 1948 Palestinian War that enveloped the plain of Sharron. It was well before the last war that a whole string of cars was waylaid on the Jericho road and robbed. In the case of the men, the robbers wanted footgear—awkward for them on reaching Jerusalem. The ladies were required to open their vanity bags for inspection and extrusion. Among the latter was Winifred Coate who acted with the poise of the Headmistress she was. It so

happened that just about the time of his incident, the Mission had published in picture from the story of the Good Samaritan and the cover picture showed the traveller who had fallen among thieves. The following week, Miss Coate was at tea at the Newman School of Missions and the opportunity was taken of presenting her with a copy of the booklet in fitting commemoration of the recent incident. She glanced at the cover and looked up with the words, "What impudence!" The incident is not mentioned for its own sake as being out of the ordinary experiences of missionary life, but as an introduction to the career of someone quite obviously destined to be a Headmistress—and was both in Cairo and Jerusalem—but never anticipated being called upon to organise one of the most remarkable voluntary agencies which have worked for the benefit and uplift of Palestine's refugee population. The industrial centre at Zerka and the reclamation of the desert in what is now the growing village of Abdelliyeh will remain as the memorial to one missionary who transferred both talents and affection from education to the practical rehabilitation of human families. It is just this sort of enterprise which has justified the validity of Christian witness in the Islamic world. "You can tell Miss Coate," said King Husain, "that she has the King's support!"*

Here it can be seen how inseparable is the mission of Christian workers like these from the manners and mores of the West, for Christianization and westernization virtually amount to the same thing.

Mr. H. P. Elson, who founded the Raymund Lull Home for Moslem boys in Tangier, Morocco writes: "For nine years we have been working among children in the face of great opposition. What has been accomplished has

*"Jerusalem: Byways of Memory Characters on the Highway," *The Muslim World*, Hartford Seminary Foundation, Hartford Connecticut. January 1967 pp. 37-41.

been through prayer. Inch by inch the ground has been taken. We began by taking one boy and now we have twenty-seven in our home. Our chief aim is to bring them to Christ." A lad from the Riff country who was in this Home to learn the printing trade was too restless to remain for long. He joined the French army and was eventually sent to the front. Afterwards he wrote from the military hospital; "I have not forgotten what I learned. Only the Lord Jesus Christ can cleanse my heart from sin. I now believe in Him."*

What cheap and debased spirituality the Christian misssonaries teach can be gauged from the following incident related enthusiastically by Dr. Samuel Zwemer as proof of the educational and religious success of his work:

At the Bannu Mission in India once at a cricket match with a rival school when the issue of the game was hanging in the balance and depended on the last man who had just gone in making four runs, a Muhammadan Afghan, one of the eleven, retired to a corner of the field and repeated the Lord's Prayer, closing with a petitio for the victory of the school and returned to find the winning run just made!**

What sort of cultural and spirtual values do the Christian missionaries preach? The answer can be found in the biography of one Muslim convert to Evangelical Christianity as enthusiastically related by Dr. Wysner, Secretary of the International Missionary Council of America and an ordained minister of the Methodist Church:

Hassan came from a fine Muslim family in the very

*Childhood in the Moslem World*, Samuel M. Zwemer, op. cit., pp. 256-257.

***Ibid.*, pp. 250-251.

fanatical city of Damascus. His father was a *mujtahid* so respected by all the community that when he died, the entire bazar was closed in his honour. The boy, although brought up in a strict Muslim home, during his school days became a disciple of science and an unbeliever in religion. He met a school friend named Yusuf who was a Christian. Yusuf helped Hassan through his period of doubt and Hassan in time became a Christian. As was to be expected, consternation reigned in his wealthy and influential family. Disinherited, he left the city of his birth and found work at a bank in another city. Although Hassan earns his living through his work at the bank, he finds his real life in the church. As a Muslim living in a fanatical environment, he was taught that music was sinful, yet he was a lover of good music. Since becoming a Christian, he has learned to play the violin. One of his greatest delights is being a member of the youth choir aud he constantly marvels at the wounderful heritage in Christian hymnody into which he has entered. Hassan loved drawing but he had been taught that whoever draws a picture of a living thing will be asked to give it a soul on the resurrection day, so he was never encouraged to develop his talent for art. Now he is using this ability and is looked upon as an unusually fine amateur artist. One Easter morning at the church breakfast, he put at every place a water colour representing some flower, each one different. Whenever scenery is needed by the young people for a dramatic program, Hassan paints it. When Hassan learned that new leaflets were needed for evangelistic work, he wrote one entitled, "How I Found My Purpose in Life". This is now a very popular piece of literature.*

The Christian missionary can rightly claim to be the foremost champion of feminism in the Muslim

*Caught in the Middle ; the Youth of the Middle East*, Gloria M. Wysner, Friendship Press, New York, 1958, pp. 75-76.

world. As a result of the work of their missionaries, Muslims educated in their schools have for more than a half century, vehemently denounced the whole institution of *Purdah* so successfully that the Governments have made the slogan of women's "emancipation" their own. For several decades in the upper-class Arab families, the veiling and seclusion of women in the privacy of their homes has been only a memory. Here is how the wife of one of the leading Christian missionaries in Iraq—Mrs. John Van-Ess—describes the changes, since opening a mission school for girls in 1909 in Basra, she has worked so hard to bring about. Although from a casual reading of her book it may appear that she is describing the traditional mode of life with sympathy, the enthusiasm with which she lauds the westernization of her former pupils, leaves no doubt that she does not in the slightest regret its disappearance.

When I went to see Fatima's granddaughter soon after her marriage in 1957, I found her living in a pleasant modern house in a newly developed residential part of town. Acres of date gardens had been cut through and laid out in broad open avenues and rows of comfortable one or two storied houses had been built, each with its own plot of ground. Hollyhocks were already in bloom, a grape arbor was started and so was a rose garden. After I had congratulated Soheila, she showed me her new home. She was especially proud of her kitchen with its electric refrigerator and gleaming latest-model oil cooking range. The bathroom was also of the most modern type and there was an air-conditioner in the bedroom. Then we went back to her living room, settled ourselves on the sofa and I looked around with great interest. The room was furnished in simple, modernistic furniture with handsome

lamps and vases, a well-filled bookcase and her wedding photograph with her husband on a small table. Across from it was her graduating picture in cap and gown with her diploma from the American Beirut College for Women in her hand. She had just married a cousin who, after graduating from the American University of Beirut, had gone to Scotland to study medicine. He was now one of the doctors on the staff of the Port Directorate of Basrah and had specialized in public health.

"What did you major in at college?" I asked Soheila.

"Euthenics!" she answered. "It's old-fashioned to call it Home Economics. Euthenics means the science and art of controllable environment or the science and art of right living. We each had a turn living in the model home and sharing all the housework but I liked my work in the nursery school best of all. I wrote my thesis on child care in Iraq and I am so lucky I am going to have a job next year in the new government kindergarten. These days we have our jobs as well as our homes. At first it was hard on those girls to come back to Iraq from Lebanon or Egypt where social life was so much more free. Even though they were unveiled, they couldn't go about in mixed company with their husbands and it was even harder for unmarried, girls, especially the ones with jobs : they had to be so very circumspect. It's a lot better now. In Bagdad, even more than in Basrah, more and more women are going to the social clubs and enjoying the swimming pools and the tennis courts along with their husbands and children. They all go to musical concerts, lectures and the cinema together too."

"What tremendous strides have been made in women's freedom in only two years!" I exclaimed. I had retired officially from my mission school in 1955 and had spent more time in Kuwait and in Jerusalem than in Iraq since then. It was of deep interest to me on this visit to Basrah to hear of the activities of my friends' daughters and my old pupils.

Next day I went to spend with Hajjia. We had long arrears of personal news to catch up on. My mouth was watering for one of her delicious Arab meals and I was particularly anxious to have a good talk with the two young women in the family, her niece and the young half sister who was brought up by Hajjia after her parents had both died.

I had paid them a short preliminary call when I first came back to Basrah and I had been electrified to meet the two young ladies later in one of the large dry goods shops on a modern shopping street in a new part of town. They were unveiled and greeted me as unconcernedly as though they had been going about in that fashion all their lives.

"Hajjia, I could hardly believe my eyes !" I exclaimed to her when I saw her at her home. "How did you ever give them permission.?"

Hajjia laughed ruefully. "They've been doing it for months. What else could I do but allow them to go about like everyone else?"

"Hajjia," I asked her curiously, "tell me, does your belief in Fate cover this situation too ? In other words, do you feel that God wills that women shall now have their personal freedom ?"

"We are all in God's hands," she replied solemnly. "Nothing can happen to true believers unless it is ordained by Him."

"Remember Hafsa," she went on. "She had never been outside Basrah before when he went to join her husband in Scotland where he was studying medicine. After she got into the plane at the airport here in Basrah, she took off her *abba* and veil and threw them down to the people who were seeing her off and she never wore them again."

"I met her at a party in England that autumn," I said, "and she was just as much at ease there as any of the English girls."

"You'll come to it yet, my sister !" said Alia gleefully.

"God is great!" remarked Hajjia darkly and we passed on to other subjects.*

Although none of her former pupils about whom she writes formally converted to Christianity, Mrs. Van-Ess seems to be satisfied that her mission has found fulfillment in weaning them from Islamic to Western ways. This Christian missionary activity has borne its luxuriant fruit at such institutions as the American University of Beirut, the American College in Cairo and Robert's College in Istanbul.

Since most of the countries with Muslim majorities have attained nominal independence, Christian missionary endeavour, with the tacit approval of anti-Islamic governments, enjoyed spectacular success undreamt of while under colonial rule. One of the countries where Christian missionaries are most active is Indonesia. The report published in *Time Magazine* of June 16, 1967 has this to say:

> During the long, unhappy dictatorship of Sukarno, Christian missionaries in Indonesia were plagued by Communist troublemakers and Moslem terrorists and subjected to periodic harassment by a capricious government. Today this predominantly Moslem nation—in which Christians number less than 10% of the 110 million population—is the scene of such an explosive evangelical revival that the U. S. journal, *Presbysterian Life*, calls one of largest movements towards Christianity in modern decades. In the twenty months since the anti-communist revolution, Roman

***Fatima and her Sisters ; a Fascinating View of the Vanished and Romantic World of Arab Women in the Era of the Veil,* Dorothy Van-Ess, John Day Company, New York, 1961, pp. 163-170.

Catholic and Protestant Churches have won an estimated 250,000 concerts. In East and Central Java alone, 65,000 persons have been converted. In North Sumatra, 16,000 have joined Christian churches. Thirty new congregations with a membership of 5,000 have been founded in one section of West Borneo. In Djakarta 50 new Bible student groups have sprung up and so great is the demand for Bibles that a shortage has developed. The U.S. National Council of Churches has launched a drive for $300,000 to help Indonesian Protestants assimilate their new members. For the most part, missionaries are accepting the conversion as a genuine response to the message of Christ. The Reverend Addison J. Eastman, mission director of the National Council of Churches for Asia, believes that many of the converts are inspired with a personal faith and really hope that the Christian church can provide a base from which to work for humane social progress.

This situation is most appalling and intolerable. It certainly reflects grave discredit upon the Muslims that they have not been able to present the teachings of Islam in an effective manner to the local non-Muslim population, thereby permitting Christian missionaries from the West to fill this spirtual void. The politicians in power in major Muslim states also are partially responsible. Since they have adopted the creed of secularism, they are completely indifferent to what is happening. According to Islam, the Muslim ruler is responsible for the spiritual as well as material welfare of his subjects. It is his duty to see that Islam is extensively propagated. Christian missionary propaganda is backed both by governments and individuals. Equipped with huge funds, they are using every means, including persuasion, temptation and compulsion, to convert ignorant people in non-

Christian areas. Libraries, seminar halls, schools, clubs, colleges, orphanages, hospitals and social welfare centres are extensively utilized by them to serve as missionary platforms. In poverty-stricken areas they supply living quarters, agricultural land and foreign scholarships to attract converts in large numbers. In Asian and African countries the people, who are the victims of poverty and all kinds of social injustice, are attracted by these missionary tactics and village after village turns hostile to Islam within a few years. This campaign for conversion also yields political gains and in some of the Islamic states, these missionaries have grown in power to such an extent that they even over-rule the authority of the state. This is an extremely grave and shocking situation and those in power in Muslim-majority states must reverse their attitudes both for the sake of Allah and their own welfare. The situation in some of the Muslim countries, particularly Africa and Indonesia, is extremely grave. Only a short time ago, Muslims constituted an overwhelming majority in most of the African countries but today the non-Muslims are almost equal to the Muslims and if present trends continue, the proportion may even be reversed ! In the January 1970 issue of *The International Review of Missions*, D. B. Barrett, joyfully predicts that by A.D. 2,000, there will be 350 million Christians in Africa.

The Christian church in Kenya is perhaps the best organized Christian missionary movement on the continent of Africa. The unity of the Church is so strong here that one can see widely divergent Christian groups such as the Catholics and Protestant churches make a common

cause, by particulating in the same organization ; the National Christian Council of Kenya. This organization has the unstinted support of the government and the local press and has emerged today as the greatest challenge to Islamic organizations in that country. The success of the N.C.C.K. lies in the fact that it has departed from the traditional strategy of Christian missionary work on this continent. While during the colonial days the Church was identified with the white rulers and had a policy of the dog's collar and the Bible, it has today emerged with radical policies which enable it to identify itself with the national needs of a developing country. Some of the various projects in which the N.C.C.K. is engaged are : refugee service, religious syllabuses and other educational matters, communication, relief, medical services, vocational training, leadership training at the national level, agricultural and self-help projects all over the land. The Church, having won the support of the Government authorities, through its involvement in nation-building, the propagation of the Bible is *de facto* an assured success. The philosophy of the role of the Church in the national development of the emergent African nations can be summed up by the following extract from the SODEPAX (The Committee on Society, Development and Peace of the World Council of Churches and the Pontifical Commission of Justice and Peace) report of the Limuru conference held in Kenya in February 1971 on the present role of the Church. "The call to the Churches in Africa as elsewhere is to proclaim the redeeming love of Christ. That proclamation is made in preaching the sacrificial life of the Church and in the caring service of the helpless and hopeless whether rich or poor. The redeeming love of God which sets us free is a challenge to share our freedom by liberating those who are oppressed by injustice, by despair, ignorance and resignation. This liberation from oppression is the process of encouraging men as individuals and as members of a

community to realize their fullest potential as the created sons of God. It is this that we mean by development. Thus understood, we believe there is no contradiction between the biblical call to the Churches to preach the Gospel and the modern emphasis on the Churches' role in development. Throughout the region, the great mass of the people living in the villages will continue to be the victims of drought or flood, disease and isolation. The desire to see an end to the suffering implied in these facts is the desire for development. The desire to see them change according to the demands of the humanity of man is the desire for a strategy of development that does justice to the activity of God in our society."

It should be remembered that Christian missionary organizations in Kenya as elsewhere in Africa do not only operate with lavish financial resources but are also supported by well-trained man-power. Its new character is so broad-based that social workers, engineers, teachers, architects, doctors and experts of various disciplines have joined hands to intensify the silent Christain campaign against Islam. The Peace Corps from America and the Voluntary Service Overeas (V. S.) from Britain every year send large numbers of University graduates who engage in useful projects in return for only a modest subsistance fee as their renumeration. Supported by inexhaustible financial aid from the Church of Rome as well as the Church of England, the N.C.C.K. is in the forefront of development. To the African for whom Christianity was formerly an alien culture identified with white supremacist and racist rule, the modern development work of the Church has today made Christianity appear synonymous with social progress and material well-being.*

*A Challenge Facing Islam in Kenya," Dr. Hassen Kasem Ali, *Muslimnews International*, Karachi, September 1971, pp. 26-28.

The three most effective methods of the Christian missionaries here in Pakistan are : (1) hospitals ; (2) bookshops ; (3) schools. Christian hospitals offer free treatment or charge only nominal fees but along with the treatment, the patient is heavily indoctrinated and the credulousness of the ignorant and illiterate are exploited to such an extent that Christian doctors do not hesitate to adopt such gimmics as the giving to the patient plain, coloured water and asking him to drink the "medicine" with the name of Holy Prophet Muhammad on his lips. When this quite naturally fails to effect any improvement, the patient is then told to drink the genuine medicine in the name of Jesus Christ and thus cured, he learns to lose faith in Islam.

Here are some other novel methods which Christian missionaries adopt to gain the confidence of the simple-minded :

> Harris spent over a year studying Chinese but as he travelled, he realized that it was equally important for him to be able to use the Quran and the Arabic version of the Bible. He painted verses from the Arabic Bible on a six-foot long banner and went out to preach in the Muslim quarter of Lanchow. The Muslims were attracted by the novelty of a Chinese evangelist and an American missionary preaching from texts written in Chinese and Arabic. They would seldom refuse and never destroy a Chinese Christian tract if the cover was printed in attractive Arabic script. In order to achieve greater effectiveness, Harris learned the art of Arabic calligraphy. He produced a special calendar with Chinese, Muslim and Christian dates with quotes from the Scripture. The posters were modified to exclude the sign of the cross lest it shied away the Muslims. But as all that would not take things beyond the street corners,

> a novel way to the doors of the Muslim homes had to be found. Since the Muslims could not resist the appeal of little children and loved to touch their skin and stroke their fine hair, smiling in friendly amusement, the white children of the missionaries came in handy as a decoy for reaching the women and girls in the semi-seclusion behind barred courtyard doors. The best way to gain entrance was first to take the children to the mountain stream that runs through most villages, ostensibly for a picnic. This invariably drew a crowd. The women were curious to see them and as the day wore on, Winifred (his wife) found the doors of the homes open for her. Meanwhile George made friends with men on the streets by writing their names on the cover of the evangelical tracts in Arabic. Another project that gave him contact with educated Chinese Muslims was ordering Arabic dictionaries for them by mail from Beirut.*

The political consequences of Christian missionary activity are seen at their worst in Nigeria. Under the enlightened and capable leadership of men like Premier Ahmadu Bello and Abu Bakr Tawafa Belawa, hundreds of mosques were being constructed in every corner of the land and converts by the thousands won over to Islam from Christianity and paganism. This was not to be endured by the Christian West or the Zionists who joined hands to make sure that the country would be rid of them. Consequently, in January 1966, both were murdered in the most brutal manner and Nigeria was engulfed in the chaos of endless civil war for many years afterwards.

Two years earlier in 1964, the legitimate Arab ruler of Zanzibar, Sultan Jamshid, was overthrown by

*_Torch for Islam : Biography of George K. Harris._ Malcolm R. Bradshaw, China In Mission Overseas Missionary Fellowship, _Cambridge_, 1965.

another *coup d'etat* led by an African Christian and Marxist militarist clique. During those terrible days, countless Muslims were massacred and most of the remaining Arabs compelled to flee the island for their lives. Thus Zanzibar, for centuries a staunch outpost of Islamic civilization, is now finished as a Muslim country.

Is Pakistan next ?

In 1958 the Christians claimed to total nearly three hundred thousand in Pakistan and to have achieved here their greatest success in the conversion of Muslims. In 1951 the Christians recorded an overall increase of 30% over the 1941 figures: about 45% in East Bengal and about 15% in West Pakistan—**much more than the increase recorded for the decade 1931-1941.** In the Lahore district, the increase recorded between 1941-1951 is over 50%. For Karachi it was about 100% increase during the period. The increase has, however, been phenomenal for the period 1951-1958. The figures are available only in respect of the increase by conversion to the Roman Catholic sect and their population has recorded more than 300% increase over the 1941 figures.

At the time of Partition, while the Muslims were busy with their refugee problems and other troubles, the Christian missionaries in the Indo-Pak sub-continent saw through this position and sent out word for large-scale action. Christian missionary journals, published in countries like U.S.A., U.K. and Canada, claimed that there was a great scope for the spread of Christianity in India and Pakistan. It was specifically stated in the January 1958 issue of the well-known Christian missionary journal, *The Muslim World*, published from Hartford (U.S.A.) that "one fact stands out clearly and that is this ; In the year 1947 the equanimity of the Muslim community had been shaken as never before. Missionaries are finding individual Muslims more receptive to Christian friendship. They have been disillu-

sioned and thrown into confusion and are ready to acknowledge their needs. Never has there been greater opportunity for Christian assistance, sympathy and guidance. The Christian Committee for Relief to West Pakistan has been established in Lahore. **The Government of Pakistan in providing relief, is making every effort to assist the Church World Service. Our representatives in Pakistan write of the many courtesies and instances of cooperation on the part of Government authorities.**" In this background, therefore, enormous expansion of missionary activities took place until now there are about 40 missionary organizations in both wings of Pakistan which hail from the U.S.A., U, K., France, Italy, Sweden and other European countries, with innumerable educational and other proselytising agencies spread throughout the length and breadth of the country.*

Here in Lahore, the most important Christian missionary institutions are : *The United Christian Hospital*, *The Convent of Jesus and Mary* for English-medium education for children, the *Forman Christian College* for men and the *Kinnaird College* for women. Christian missionary schools and college set the criteria for the entire educational system in Pakistan, as the Urdu medium Government schools try their best in their curricula and educational philosophy to imitate them. Consequently, English is emphasized from the first class until graduation and the facilities for teaching Arabic and Persian are most poor and meagre. Children are taught English history from the earliest grades and therefore are totally alienated from their indigenous heritage. They learn very little of Islamic history or about the historical background of Islam in their own land. Everything

*"The Progress of Christianity in Pakistan," Sayyid Muhammad Jameel, *The Voice of Islam*, Karachi, February 1961, pp. 235-236.

is done to make English subjects at school as alluring as possible while the one course of "Islamiyat" is taught in such a repugnant matter, so unrelated and irrelevant to the rest of the curriculum, that the children naturally hate it. Islamic and Arabic studies in the colleges and universities are are intentionally made as unattractive to the students as possible. In courses on Arabic literature, the most vulgar and obscene examples are deliberately chosen while the students are stranded in the dark concerning the literary gems so that they will nurse a lifelong prejudice against Arabic. In Pakistani colleges, Islamic studies are taught from the point of view of Orientalism. Consequently, in order to learn about Islam, students are compelled to depend upon Western authorities. English readers, published in London and used by convent schools, are saturated with Greek and Roman pagan myths and tales from medieval England in archaic English which are utterly meaningless to the child living in a Pakistani environment. In these fashionable places, the children are made to dress in Western clothing. Boys are compelled by school regulations to wear neckties even during the hottest season. English food is served and pupils must eat in the English manner with knife and fork. By the time these convent pupils are ready to graduate, they are indistinguishable from Englishmen in their tastes, mode of life and mentality. From their ranks, come our rulers and leaders in all fields of national endeavour. The consequences of this disastrous policy require no further comment.

What should be done to counteract these nefarious

activities ? Naturally, far more stringent restrictions must be placed upon attempts to evangelise and de-Islamize the Muslims and, ultimately, foreign Christian missions should be banned altogether for their subversive activities. It must, however, be remembered that we cannot depend upon purely negative and repressive measures alone. They will prove entirely ineffective unless simultaneously the Muslims arise to their duty of *Tabligh*. At first this *Tabligh* must be on an individual basis before any organization can be undertaken. Individuals must take upon themselves the responsibility of propagating Islam and not depend upon the Government to do everything. The greatest weakness of *Tabligh* in the modern world is that there does not exist anywhere today, a sizeable vigorous and dynamic community which is actually translating the ideals of Islam into practice. All our preaching about Islam will have little effect upon non-Muslims so long as we cannot show them any actual and living example. A genuine Islamic state, or even a sizeable Muslim community practicing Islam in its entirety, would be our best advertisement worth infinitely more than a hundred thousand preachers or books. Once a genuine Islamic society emerges in the teeth of opposition against it, we need not send out so many preachers or books. An authentic Islamic community—vigorous, dynamic and expanding—would publicize to the world what Islam means and its contrast to the rottenness of Western hedonism would be plain for all to see. In droves non-Muslims would flock to embrace Islam just as they did to the Holy Prophet in Medina during the Year of Deputations.

We must realize that the Christian missionary institutions enjoy such immense success primarily because they fill unmet needs. In other words, missionary schools, hospitals, orphanages and other philanthropic and social welfare work flourish because *they do not encounter any rivals.* We cannot possibly close them down or transfer their management into Muslim hands until we first establish an Islamic alternative for all these facilities which must be superior to anything they can provide.

In Pakistan there are a significant number of pagan tribesmen in Kaffiristan in the west and in the Chittagong hills in Bengal. What sort of *Tabligh* are we providing for them ? To our shame and disgrace, we must admit that none of the Pakistani Muslims are doing anything to propagate Islam among these primitive people in their own land! Consequently, the Christian missionaries multiply there without any rivals to resist them. If we fail to act now, I predict that in less than a decade, most of these tribes will be Christian.

As Judaism is not a missionary faith and therefore does not present any ideological menace, it is sufficient to defeat the Jews in a *Jihad* on the battlefield in Palestine but the measures essential to combat Christian missionary activities in Muslim lands are far more complex. Here we need the pen much more than the sword. Some of our *ulema* must acquire profound and detailed learning about Christianity and its precise relationship to the history of Western culture in Europe and America.

## What are the weaknesses of Christianity with will invevitably prove fatal for its missionary activities once effective *Tabligh* is organized ?

A major weakness of Christianity lies in the lack of brotherhood and fraternity among Christian nations. Since the Bible taught the Christians the Christianity was meant for the *Bani Israil,* Christian imbibed racial pride, The result was that even in its heyday, Christianity could not forge a central political authority embodying Christian unity. On the contrary, Christianity has been responsible for encouraging racial and geographical nationalisms. Christians have assimilated the notion of racial superiority to such an extent that wherever the colonised people embraced Christiainity, they were promised entrance into the Kingdom of God but were refused admittance into the kingdom of this world. They were never accorded a place of equality in the society of white Christians.

The existence of separate spheres of the church and the state undoubtedly facilitated the consolidation of nation states in Europe during the Renaissance period. In turn, this development also helped them to implement their plans of world domination. At the same time, it is this phenomenon—the separation—of church and state—which afficted the Christian body politic with evils whose effects are becoming evident at the present time. True, the secuarist attitude of reformed Protestantism was a reaction against the tyranny and exploitation of the Catholic Church. Nevertheless, it gave birth to a number of evils and eventually released catastropic forces like Nazlsm, Fascism and Communism.

Another weakness of Christianity lies in the complexity which characterizes its creed including the fundamental article of Christian faith—the Trinity. One God in Three and Three in One is a concept which, to say the least, cannot be comprehended by ordinary minds. This sort of confounding complexity is characteristic of the entire body of

metaphysical doctrines propounded by Christians. It is the complexity of the Christian creed which compelled the Protestant reformers to revolt agaist this jigsaw puzzle of dogmas and philosophical doctrines. Moreover, the same fact encouraged and lent weight to the view that Christianity should be divested of its domineering position in the realms of social and political life. This gave birth to a religion (or a set of religions?) all based on false and erronous notions. The so called reformed Christianity totally destroyed religious faith and devotion. In their present form, the Christian churches fail to be understood, much less to carry conviction with men of average intellect. Enthusiastic exponents of Christianity proudly claim that Christian doctrine can only have an appeal for the civilized mind and it is for this reason that, in contrast with Islam, Christianity is receiving no response from the uncivilized Africans. *Such a claim implies that the complicated dogmas of Christianity are not in harmony with the natural temperament of man and that Christianity is rather an unsuccessful attempt to make a religion out of philosophy.*

The most serious shortcoming of Christianity, however, lies in the fact that it has no vigorous and comprehensive social philosophy. Primitive Christianity, however, attached no value to the preservation of the state, law, organization, or production. It simply does not reflect on the conditions of human society. Hence it must either aim at being without a state or it can decide to possess a state alongside of its religious creed as a political creed as well. Such a thing should appear inconceivable in respect to Christianity as a revealed religion but what actually happened was that due to the impact of close contact with neighbouring civilizations during the first two centuries of Christian history, particularly with the Hellenistic civilization, the idea of "The Kingdom of Heaven" in its narrower connotation was stressed while the earth was left to the tender mercies of the Ceasars. This duality ultimately led to the emergence

of Protestantism which dealt a crushing blow to the power of the Christian Church.

Communist nihilism is a natural reaction against the unsatisfying *Weltenschauung* (world out-look) of Christianity. Christianity has failed to resist Communism. About one third of the Christian population of the world (about 260 million) has already fallen under Communist rule. Out of the other two thirds, a considerable section of it is under Communist influence. Such a tremendous loss within less than half a century constitutes a danger of the highest magnitude. The attempt to keep religion confined to the private sector of human life is doomed to fail because life refuses to keep itself confined within any such artificial boundaries. Unfortunately, Christianity is adamant on the issue and stubbornly insists that politics be treated as a forbidden tree. Christianity as a political force is facing a bleak future.

Although Christians are the largest single religious community in the world, it has now become quite obvious that Christianity has failed in its missionary endeavours. Hence the Christian population is concentrated in Europe and the New World (*i.e.* North and South America, Australia and New Zealand). Outside these areas, the number of Christians is negligible. This is astonishing in view of the very earnest and powerful drive of Christians under the shadow of their dominance in large parts of the world, to win converts to their faith. In the New World, Christianity was confronted by none of the great and civilized religions of the world. The native population consisted of wild tribes who were pagans. Hence it is not in the least surprising that by dint of a superior culture and greater political power, Christianity vanquished native paganism. Even this it could not do without physically exterminating most of the red Indians. It is noteworthy that wherever in Europe and in the New World Christianity came across paganism, it did succeed to a great extent in its missionary endeavours. But in the East where it encountered organized

religions like Islam, Buddhism, Hinduism, Confucianism and Shintoism, its missionary endeavours proved of no avail despite the absolute political dominance of Christian nations over Eastern lands.*

Here is a confession of the failure of Christianity by a poor and uneducated, but intelligent youth who lives in Mexico City :

> I always had an enormous curiousity about the Bible but had been afraid to read it for fear of being excommunicated from the Church. When I was about fourteen, I read the Old Testament because of my passion for history. I don't know how I got hold of it because my father would never permit it in the house. A friend of mine had told me that it was all right to read the Old Testament but that I shouldn't under any circumstances, read the New Testament. One afternoon in Mexicali, I had nothing to read so I began to leaf through the Bible. As I read it I was overcome with fear, not because it was different from what I had been taught but because I realized that by reading the scriptures and the Commandments and learning the laws myself, I would be like a graduate lawyer who knew the punishment for every offence. I wouldn't need to place my faith in lawyers and secretaries when I myself could speak directly to the President! The saints were only idols of stone or plaster made by the hands of men so why should I pray to them? I realized that because of the saints, we had as many gods as the Aztec Indians; the only difference was that we modernized the images. I began analyzing things. Jesus said, "Like this fig tree, by their fruits you shall know them." In the Mexican jails, out of one hundred prisoners, ninety-nine are Catholics. And if my friends, who are thieves, can light a candle to a little saint before going out to rob; if prostitutes keep a saint in

*Living Religions of the World : A Socio-Political Study*, Ahmad Abdullah al-Masdoosi, Begum Aisha Bawany Wakf, Karachi, 1962, pp. 188-194.

their rooms and burn sanctified candles and pray for more clients ; if there are such perversions within Catholicism, can that be the true religion ? And the priests ! I was disillusioned about them too, because they do not obey God's law. I knew a priest who drank whiskey and played poker right inside the church. And by coincidence, priests always seemed to have a sister and couple of nephews living in their house. After reading about the humble life of Jesus, I asked ; Does the Pope sleep on the floor? Does he live the life of the Nazarene, begging alms, deprived of food, suffering rain and cold to go out and preach love for God and for one's neighbours? No, the Pope lives in portentious opulance and is fantastically wealthy because the churches all over the world send him the money they collect. Just the money collected on one Sunday at the Basilica of Guadalupe here would support me and my family all our lives ! In what kind of poverty does the Pope live ? And where is his charity if there is so much misery in Rome itself?*

In December 1967, Maulana Abul Ala Maudoodi received from Pope Paul VI, a special plea to observe January 1, 1968 as a "Day of Peace." He wrote:

We address ourselves to all men of good will to exhort them to celebrate "The Day of Peace" throughout the world, on the first day of the year January 1, 1968. We think that this proposal interprets the aspirations of people, of their governments, of international organizations which strive to preserve peace in the world, of those religious institutions so interested in the promotion of peace, of cultural, political, and social movements which makes Peace their ideal: or youth whose perspicacity regarding the new paths of civilization, dutifully oriented towards its peaceful developments is more lively; of wise men who see how much

**The Children of Sanchez ; The Autobiography of a Mexican Family*, Oscar Lewis, Random House, New York, 1961 pp. 331-332.

today, peace is both necessary and threatened. The proposal to dedicate to peace the first day of the new year is not intended therefore as exclusively Roman Catholic. It would hope to have the adherence of all the true friends of peace as if it were their own initiative to be expressed in a free manner, congenial to the particular character of those who are aware of how beautiful and how important is the harmony of all voices in the world for the examination of his primary good, which is peace, in the varied concert of modern humanity. The Catholic Church will call the attention of its children to the duty of observing "The Day of Peace" with the religious and moral expressions of the Christian faith but it considers it its duty to remind all those who agree on the opportuneness of such a "Day", some points which ought to characterize it. First among these is: the necessity of defending peace in the face of dangers which always threaten it: the danger of the survival of selfishness in the relations among nations; the danger of violence into which some populations can allow themselves to be drawn by desperation at not having their rights to life and human dignity recognized and respected; the danger today tremendously increased or recourse to frightful weapons of extermination which some nations possess, spending enormous financial means, the expenditure of which is reason for painful reflection in the presence of the grave needs which hinder the development of so many other people; the danger of believing that international controversies cannot be resolved by the ways of reason, that is, by negotiations founded on law, justice, and equity but only by means of deterrent and murderous force. The subjective foundation of peace is a new spirit which must animate co-existence between peoples, a new outlook on man, his duties and his destiny. Much progress must still be made to render this outlook universal and effective; a new training must educate the new generations to reciprocal respect between nations, to brotherhood between peoples, to collaboration between races with a view also to their progress

> and development. The international organizations which have been set set up for this purpose must be supported by all, become better known and be provided with the authority and means fit for their great mission. A warning must be kept in mind. Peace cannot be based on a false rhetoric of words which are welcomed because they answer to the deep, genine aspirations of humanity but which can also serve and unfortunately have sometimes served to hide the lack of true spirit and of real intentions for peace, if not indeed to mask sentiments and actions of oppression and party interests. Peace is not pacificism ; it does not mask a base and slothful concept of life, but it proclaims the highest and most universal values of life : truth, justice, freedom, love.*

Beautiful words indeed! But I would answer the message of the pope with this blunt reply : "I take no heed to what you say! I pay attention only to what you do !"

When Jesus Christ returns to earth, where will he go—to the church or to the mosque ? We are quite confident that he would scorn the church as having nothing whatever to do with him ; he would surely smash the images of the Crucifixion as a malicious lie and destroy all the paintings and statutes representing him, his mother and the saints as idolatry. I am certain that when Jesus Christ returns to earth, he will go straight to the *Bait ul Muqaddas* in Jerusalem and lead the *Juma Salat* as our *Imam* ! He will surely find those most receptive to his teachings among the Arab refugees from the small farming

*Text quoted from *Muslims and the Christian World*, Sayyid Abul Ala Maudoodi, Jama'at-e-Islami, Karachi, March 1, 1968, pp. 1-4.

villages in Palestine. He would sleep on the ground with them, share their meagre, miserable meals and find them the first to follow him! Who but among these simple Arab-Muslim *fellaheen* from Palestine and adjacent lands would Jesus find his most enthusiastic supporters ? Nowhere could he feel more out of place than in the Vatican ! He would be the last man ever to seek an audience with the Pope ! And to the sleek, sophisticated, complacent, smug and arrogant church and synagogue-goers in Europe and America, he would tell them as he did the stiff-necked Pharisees two thousand years before:

> Oh Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets and stonest them who are sent unto thee, how often I would have gathered thy children under her wing and ye would not ! I send unto you prophets and wise men and scribes and some of them ye kill and crucify and some of them ye scourge in your synagogues and drive them from city to city. Even as ye also outwardly appear righteous unto men but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity. Behold, your house is left unto you desolate. For nation shall rise against nation and kingdom against kingdom and there shall be famines and pestilences and earthquakes in diverse places. And many false prophets shall rise and deceive you and because iniquity will abound, the love of man shall wax cold. Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of Hell ?*

*(*Matthew*, 23 : 33-38, 24 ; 7-12)

## ISLAM—THE ONLY ALTERNATIVE

How can we be certain that Islam is the only infallible truth?

Islam means submission to the will of God through unquestioning obedience to His Law in the Holy Quran and the Sunnah of the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him). Judaism is named after the tribe of Judah and Christianity after Jesus Christ (peace be upon him). Thus even the names of these faiths illustrate their restrictive character. The name of Islam proves its universality. What a contrast to the views expressed during a recently held interfaith conference in Washington D.C. where Dr. Isaac Franck, Executive Vice-President of the Jewish Community Council of Washington said that Judaism considers itself as valid only for Jews and does not attempt to impose its views upon non-Jews. He declared : "The validity of non-Jewish theological beliefs is not subject to our evaluation or judgment." To me this is conclusive proof that Judaism must be false because an omnipotent God would never restrict His truth to a single people. Truth by its very nature must be universal !

Islam is unique among all other religions in that it alone possesses an authentic scriptures. The Holy Quran informs us that the Jews and Christians have corrupted their scriptures by mixing the original revelation with human interpolations and interpretations

until the former could not be distinguished from the latter. Under the devastating impact of "Higher Criticism" very few, if any, Jewish or Christian scholars today accept their Holy Books as infallible Divine revelation. Jews and Christians themselves admit that they do not possess their original Texts but only translations that have been undergoing numerous alterations for many centuries and are still being changed. The Holy Quran exists exactly as it was revealed to the Holy Prophet. It has been preserved in its original text forever. The languages of the former revelations to the Jews and Christians have long been dead. Today nobody can speak those languages and only a few scholars claim to be able to decipher them. Even if these scriptures had been preserved to this day in their original and unadulterated form, nobody could correctly understand them and interpret their injunctions, much less translate them into actual practice. In contrast, the language of the Holy Quran is a living language, spoken and understood by millions throughout the world. Even those who have no time to study Arabic, can easily find others who know it sufficiently to explain the meaning of the Quran. Each of the existing sacred books has been addressed to a particular people and contains commandments which seem to have been intended only for a restricted time and place, while the Holy Quran is explicitly addressed to the whole human race with an eternal code embracing life in its totality. The teachings of Judaism are restricted by their nationalist, racist emphasis while the acceptance of secularism on principle virtually negates Christianity's claim to universality.

Concerning the earlier Prophets and religious teachers, very little of their life-histories have come down to us. Thus we know less about Moses (peace be upon him) than Socrates and nothing at all concerning Jesus Christ (peace be upon him) before he began his brief three-year career of preaching.

> A cursory glance though any Hadith collection will give an idea how accurately and carefully the minutest details of the Prophet's life teachings have been recorded. There one finds astonishing details of his features, limbs of body, his gait, the manner of his conversation and speech, his smile, dress, food, sleep, his manner of eating, drinking and relaxing, his love for perfumes, his elegance, catholicity, of his taste, his fondness for riding, his zest for worship, his mode of salutation, his facial expression, his behaviour in joy and sorrow, his wars, his way of offering condolence, his mode of offering prayers and observing fasts, his pilgrimages, his intense devotion to God, his noble feelings and sentiments, his perseverence, his dealings with his fellow beings, his honesty, his hospitality, his deep rooted sympathy for his own kith and kin, his dealings with strangers, with enemies, his hatred for back-biting and vanity, his simplicity, his bravery, his determination, his truthfulness, his adherence to his promises, his forgiveness, his behaviour towards his equals, towards his elders and youngers, his treatment of women, his kindness to mankind and animals, his means of livelihood, his experiences as a traveller, as a warrior, as a law-giver, as a father, as a general, ruler, as a saint, as a pious hermit, as an arbitrator ; in fact, all phases and aspects of his life have been carefully recorded. One is amazed at the boldness and courage with which he laid open before the people not only his public but also his private life. Who can stand the ordeal of voluntarily offering himself as an object of observation for all the twenty-four hours throughout his life?

> Only a person of unusual integrity and honesty, possessing a high degree of self-confidence. self-control and self-determination could do it. It was, he alone who can stand this test. He not only permitted people to peep into the innermost chambers of his sacred life but also exhorted them to broadcast its details to others because even these facts were as divinely illuminated as his public career. A Muslim is therefore enjoined to follow the prophet's example in his private life with the same sincerity and faithfulness as he is commanded in respect of the sphere of his public life. Every word that he uttered and every action that he performed are the public trust, faithfully handed over to humanity from generation to generation as Divinely inspired.*

Islam alone constitutes a complete, all-embracing, comprehensive way of life where the individual versus his society and material versus the spiritual are balanced into a perfect harmony. The laws of Islam are called the *Shariah* that provides an infallible Guidance of all aspects of individual and collective life. The *Shariah* embraces religious ritual, personal character, morals, intimate habits, family relationships, social and economic affairs, administration, rights and duties of citizens, judicial system, laws of war and peace and international relations. These injunctions enable the faithful to distinguish between what is good and evil, what is beneficial and harmful, what is useful or injurious, what are the virtues we must cultivate and encourage and what we must avoid ; the sphere of our personal freedom and its limitations and what methods we must adopt to establish a genuine Islamic community.

**Prophethood in Islam*, Abdul Hameed Siddiqui, Islamic Publications Ltd·, Lahore, 1968 pp. 51-53.

Islam teaches that unaided intellect and personal experience alone are unreliable and defective guides which can never discover sound ethical values. The purpose of ethical endeavour in Islam, is to seek the pleasure of God. In Islam, morality is absolute and unchanging because its laws are instituted by God and not by men. The true Muslims does not change with the changing times but forces the times to conform to his standards.

Islam abhors the doctrine of secularism. The Muslim can thrive only in an Islamic environment which is his duty to establish :

> Those who imagine that the morality of Islam makes of it a heavy burden for humanity derive this belief from the tribulations undergone by the individual Muslims living in a society which is not governed by Islam. Under such circumstances the morality of Islam is a heavy burden ; it almost crushes the individuals who live with their pure Islam in the polluted society of ignorance. A specific environment is indispensible for the life of this concept, an environment with its own specific values. Islam is a realistic system and it therefore supposes that the people who live according to its path will be living in an Islamically-governed society. Without this environment, the life of the individual become impossible or at least extremely difficult. Therefore whoever wishes to be a Muslim should know that he cannot devote himself to his practice of Islam except in a Muslim environment dominated by Islam. He is mistaken if he imagines that he can realize his Islam in the midst of a society ignorant of Divine guidance*

Alone among all the religions of the world, Islam

**This Religion of Islam,* Sayyid Quṭb, Al-Manar Press, Palo Alto, California, 1967, pp. 32-34.

created a state dominated by religious and moral motives, thereby demonstrating that political power can and ought to be subordinated to ethical ends and that religion must not be allowed to serve the ends of any political system devoid of moral ideals.

Islam teaches us that one must attain spiritual progress through active participation in normal everyday life and for this reason condemns the practice of monasticism, asceticism or celibacy. The doctrines of Islam are characterized by their simplicity, explicitness and highly realistic attitude towards human problems indulging neither in excessive optimism nor pessimism, and enjoining moderation in all things. Islam is free from incomprehensible theology or burdensome rituals. Religious creeds shrouded in philosophical complexities may give intellectual pleasure to the few but can never inspire ordinary men and women to be steadfast in virtue.

The racism and nationalism of Judaism makes a mockery of its ethical teachings while Christianity's propagation of the doctrine of the Trinity and the vicarious atonement of mankind's sins by Jesus Christ (peace be upon him) nullifies all its moral values. In Islam there are no such loopholes.

> The correct course of life for man is to live in complete obedience to God. It is not for man to determine his mode of worship and obedience ; it is for God to decide this. God, being his master, has raised from time to time prophets for the guidance of humanity and revealed His books through them. It is the duty of man to take the code of his life from these sources of divine guidance. Man is answerable to God for all his actions in life. The time for rendering an account will be in the life-hereafter

and not in this world. The short span of worldly life is really an opportunity to prepare for that great test. In this life, all efforts of man should be centred on the object of soliciting the blessings of God in the Hereafter. He, with all his faculties and potentialities, is on trial. There will be an impartial assessment of his conduct in life by a Being Who keeps a complete and correct record, not merely of his movements and actions and their influence on all that is in the world, but also a full record of his innermost ideas, feelings and intentions. /pp. 38-39). According to Islam, God has appointed the human soul as His vicegerent in the universe. The body has been created with the sole object that the soul should make use of it in the exercise of its authority and the fulfilment of its duties and responsibilities. Hence the body is not a prison house for the soul but its workshop or factory and if there is any possibility for the growth and development of the soul, it is only through the use of the powers, machines and instruments provided by this workshop. Consequently, this world is a field in which God has sent us to work and do our duty towards Him. The spiritual development which is possible in this world should not take the form of man turning his face away from this workshop and retreating to some uninhabited corner. Rather, the only form it should take is that man should live and work in it and give the best account of himself. It is in the nature of an examination centre for him. Every aspect and sphere of life, is as it were, like a question paper in this test ; home, the family, the neighborhood, the society, the market place, the office, the factory, the school, the law courts, the police station, the parliament, the peace conference and the battlefield, all represent 'question papers' on different subjects which man has been called upon to answer. If he does not take any question paper or leaves most of the answers blank, he is bound to fail in the examination. The only possibility of success would be in a man's spending his whole time and giving his whole attention to this examination and to attempt as

far as possible to answer all the question papers handed over to him. (pp. 106-108).*

Islam is the only religion which preaches a pure and unadulterated monotheism that tolerates no compromises with nationalism, racism, trinitarianism, saint-worship, veneration of images or priesthood. Wholehearted acceptance of the doctrine of *Tauhid* or the Unity of God makes the believer broadminded and sympathetic to all his fellow beings made by the same Creator, produces an unsurpassed dignity and self-respect, makes him indifferent to and independent and fearless of all powers other than those of God, at the same time generating in him humility and modesty. The believer in *Tauhid* is a righteous man because he is convinced that unless he acts justly, he cannot succeed. The believer does not despair and lose hope regardless of adversity. His faith that God is the Master of all the universe, whose powers and mercy are infinite, gives him immense consolation in trouble so that he never yields to pessimism and despondancy. Suicide is unthinkable. The true believer will persevere in his work with patience and implicit trust in God to the end. Faith in Islam fills the believer with unrivalled courage. Since he is convinced that his life and property belong exclusively to God, he is ready to sacrifice them at any moment for His pleasure. Since God alone can bestow life or death, no weapon, no man or animal has the power to inflct any harm upon him unless it be God's will. The true believer

**The Islamic Way of Life*, Sayyid Abul Ala Maudoodi, Islamic Publications, Ltd., Lahore, 1965.

believes that God has set his span of life in advance so that all the forces of the world combined are powerless to take away his life a moment before the appointed decree. Belief in Islam blesses the faithful with complete serenity and contentment. The believer knows that wealth belongs to God and He gives to whom He pleases. Power, honour, reputation and authority are all bestowed according to His will and it is man's duty only to strive according to His law. Success or failure depend entirely upon the will of God ; if He wills to succeed, no power in the world can prevent Him from doing so and if He does not will it, no power can force Him while atheists and polytheists think that success and failure depend upon their own unaided efforts or the help or opposition of worldly forces. Consequently, they become enslaved to jealousy and frequently resort to sordid practices to try to gain what they want. Thus it can be seen that Islam is not only the sole effective prescription for righteousness but the most potent medicine for mental health as well.

Alone among the religions of the world, Islam made a practical reality of international brotherhood based upon a commonly shared outlook on life, common practices and ideals of conduct. Islam views life as an organic whole not to be shattered into fragments. Islam follows the Muslim in every act of his life—social, political and economic. A Muslim cannot be a Muslim in the mosque and a nationalist or socialist in politics. He is a Muslim everywhere. Islam is no mere accessory to life but life itself !

Why does not Islam regard the non-Muslim as

equal to the Muslim ? If Muslims cannot regard Judaism or Christianity on a plane of equality with Islam, the non-Muslim will wonder what kind of treatment Hindus, Buddhists, pagans, agnostics and atheists can expect to receive under Muslim rule.

Islam is a universal faith open to everyone without distinction of race, nationality, cultural or intellectual attainment, social status, age or sex. Because only God can give His faith to whom He will, the Muslim regards every non-Muslim as a potential Muslim. For this reason, he is commanded to be fair and just even to those non-Muslims who are his confirmed enemies and compassionate to non-Muslims who have never committed any overt, hostile act. Islam commands the Muslim to be kind and just to non-Muslims because if we do not set an example of virtue, how can we expect others to follow us? The conviction that Islam is the only Truth and that all divergent ways are false and evil, does not make the pious Muslim an arrogant fanatic. The Holy Quran forbids spying, backbiting and heretic-hunting. Nobody is compelled to accept Islam under Muslim rule by force. The Muslim always stands before God in the utmost humility.

> Indeed you ought to realize that the pious man is he who is good in God's sight in the mansion of eternity and that is something unknown to man, postphoned to the End. Therefore you ought not to look at anyone without considering that he is superior to you. Thus, if you see a a child you say, 'This person has never sinned against God but I have sinned and so he is better than I' and if you see an older person, you say, This man was a servant of God before me and is certainly better than I' and if he is a scholar you say, 'This man has been given what I

am ignorant of; then how shall I be like him ?' and if he is ignorant, you say, This man has sinned against God in ignorance, so God's case against me is stronger and I do not know what end He will give to me and what end to him,' and if he is an infidel, you say, 'I do not know; perhaps he will become a Muslim and his life will end in doing good and because of his acceptance of Islam, his sins will be forgiven but as for me—God is our refuge—perhaps God will lead me astray so that I become an infidel and my life ends in doing evil and then tomorrow he will be among those brought near to God and I shall be among the condemned'. So let fear of the End occupy you and keep you from making yourself, despite the doubt about your death, to be above the servants of God most high. Your certitude and faith at present do not exclude the possibility of your changing in the future for God is disposer of hearts : He guides whom He will and leads astray whom He will.*

The opposition of Islam to divergent faiths, philosophies and ideologies is not directed towards any hatred of individuals but rather the system that has produced them. It is not persons which Islam opposes but perverted values and evil ways of life which lead only to ruin and disaster, but because all non-Islamic ways are wrong, the leaders who personify these values and are fighting with all sorts of cruel and treacherous means day and night to obliterate the truth of Islam from the world, become hateful and therefore must be hated and opposed with every resource we possess. Hatred of evil and falsehood is not a sin but the highest virtue. Hate is the natural reaction of love. We cannot love a thing without hating what is the opposite to it and our hatred is in proportion to our love. The

*The Faith and Practice of Al-Ghazzali, Montgomery Watt, Goerge Allen and Unwin, London, 1953, pp. 146-147.

purpose of hate is to clear the path of love, to approach near to the beloved ideal and to love it more ardently. War, when fought in the service of truth, justice and virtue is a positive good. Pacificism is tantamount to non-resistance to evil and leads to apathy, indifference and all kinds of moral corruption.

**Islam teaches that a common faith is the only bond which can unite the human race.** A man should be judged only on the criterion of whether he is believer or a non-believer and how effectively he implements his faith in his practical daily life. Such distinctions as race, nationality or social status are mere accidents of birth over which the individual has no control. Any discrimination on these grounds is rank injustice. The individual is responsible for what he believes and what he does. He is always at liberty to determine his faith and control his behaviour.

Conflicting ideologies, where the interest of one group cannot be attained except at the expense of its rivals, can never be united or even peacefully co-exist simply by proclaiming the fact that all are human beings. The utter failure of such world organizations as the League of Nations and the United Nations is proof of this fallacy. **Universal peace and brotherhood can only be attained when the majority of mankind embrace common ideals.** Suppose a husband and wife had nothing in common. Everything he considered good, she considered evil ; whatever he thought was beautiful, she regarded as ugly ; everything he thought important, she considered trivial; everything he believed was true, she rejected as false

—they would be quarreling continuously and could not live together for a single day! They could not reconcile their differences and save their marriage simply by the assertion that both are human beings ! Although it cannot be denied that all human beings possess common qualities, in the ideological battle, the human tie alone is not enough !

On what foundation can a lasting reconciliation between Muslims, Jews and Christians be based? We must realize that **under the existing circumstances, no friendship is possible.** Jewry and Christendom have joined hands to destroy us and all we cherish. Zionism, freemasonry, Christian missionary activity and Orientalism have combined to annihilate us religiously, culturally and even physically It would be sheer folly to kiss the hands that are beating us !

Peaceful relations and mutual respect among us can only be achieved through strength. We must cease indulging in apologetics and present the Islamic message to the world honestly and forthrightly. Before we can hope to succeed with *Tabligh* on a large scale, we must first convert the nominal Muslims into true believers. We must establish a full-blooded Islamic state where the world will witness our precepts translated into action. Finally, we must crush the conspiracies of Zionism, free-masonry, Orientalism and foreign missions both with the pen and with the sword. We cannot afford peace and reconciliation with the *Ahl al-Kitab* until we can humble them and gain the upper hand.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

**Judaism:**

*A Pictorial History of the Jewish People*, Nathan Ausubel, Crown Publishers, New York, 1953.

*Everyman's Talmud*, Aaron Cohen, E. P. Dutton, New York, 1949.

*Hammer on the Rock*, A Midrash Reader, Nachum N. Glatzer, Schoken Books, New York, 1962.

*Zohar:* the Book of Splendor (Jewish Mysticism), Gershom G. Scholem, Schocken Books New York, 1963.

*The Kuzari*, Judah Ha Levi, Schocken Books, New York, 1964.

*Guide to the Perplexed*, Moses Maimonides, Dover Publications, New York, 1956.

*Daily Prayer Book*, Philip Birnbaum, Hebrew Publications, New York, 1949.

*Polish Jews : A Pictorial Record*, Roman Vishniac, Schocken Books, New York, 1965.

*Life is with the People : the Culture of the Shetl*, Mark Zborowaki and Elizabeth Herzog, Schocken Books, New York, 1962.

*Growing up Jewish*, edited by Jay David, William Marrow & Co. Inc., New York, 1969.

*Two Worlds*, My Edinburg Jewish Childhood, David Daiches, Harcourt Brace & Co., New York, 1956.

*The Promised Land*, Mary Antin, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1912.

*Marjorie Morningstar*, Herman Wouk, Pocket Books, New York, 1957.

*Judaism as a Civilization*, Mordecai Kaplan, Macmillan, New York, 1934.

*This is My God*, The Jewish Way of Life, Herman Wouk, Doubleday, New York,1960.

**Anti-Semitic Literature ;**

The Jewish Conspiracy and the Muslim World with the complete text of the *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, Misbahul Is'am Farouqi, Karachi, 1967.

*The International Jew*, Henry Ford, Gerald L.K. Smith. California, 1920.

*Mein Kamph*, Adolf Hitler, Houghton Mifflon Co., Boston, 1943.

**Jewish View of Islam:**

*Judaism and the Koran*, Abraham I. Katsh, A. S. Barnes & Co., New York, 1962.

*Judaism and Islam*, Erwin I. J. Rosenthal, Thomas Yoseloff New York, 1961.

*Jews and Arabs : their Contacts through the Ages*, S.D. Goitein, Schocken Books, New York, 1955.

**Zionism :**

*Rome and Jerusalem*, Moses Hess, H. Pordes, London, 1860.

*Auto-Emancipation*, Leo Pinsker, New York, 1944.

*The Jewish State*, Theodor Herzl, H. Pordes, London, 1967.

*The Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, Grosset & Dunlap, New York, 1962.

*Trial and Error*, Chaim Weizmann, Schocken Books, New York, 1949.

*The Rebirth and Destiny of Israel*, David Ben-Gurion, Philosophical Library, New York, 1954.

*The Voice of Israel*, Abba Eban, Horizon Press, New York, 1957.

*The Story of the Jewish Legion*, Vladimir Jabotinsky, Bernard Ackerman Inc., New York, 1945.

*The Revolt: The Story of the Irgun*, Menachem, Begin, Nash, Los Angeles, 1972.

*Diary of the Sinai Campaign*, Moshe Dayan, Schocken Books, New York, 1965.

*Eassys, Letters and Memoirs*, Achad Ha'am, Oxford University Press, London, 1946.

*Israel and the World*, Martin Buber, Schocken Books, New York, 1963.

*Children of the Kibbutz*, Melford E. Spiro Schocken Books, New York, 1958.

*From the Ends of the Earth : The Peoples of Israel*, Howard Morley Sachar, Dell Publishing Co., New York, 1964.

*The Israelis : Founders and Sons*. Amos Elon, Bantam Books, New York, 1971.

*Israel Between East and West, A Study in Human Relations*, Raphael Patai, Greenwood Publisher Corporation, Westport, Connecticut, 1970.

**Anti-Zionist Literature :**

*What Price Israel?*, Alfred Lilienthal, Henery Regnery & Co., Chicago, 1953.

*The Other Side of the Coin*, Alfred Lilienthal, Devin Adair, New York, 1965.

*The Decadence of Judaism in our Time*, Moshe Menuhin, Exposition Press, New York, 1965.

*The Arabs in Israel*, Sabri Jiryis, The Institute for Palestine Studies, Beirut, 1969.

*Israel: The Jewish State in Palestine*, Abdullah Khalid, E.A. Omari, Nairobi, Kenya, 1976.

*The Fall of Jerusalem*, Abdullah Schleifer, Monthly Review Press, New York, 1972.

*They are Human Too: A Photo-Essay on the Palestine Arab Refugees*, Per-Olow Anderson, Henry Regnery & Co., Chicago, 1957.

**Christianity :**

*The Holy Bible* (King James Version), Cambridge University Press, London, 1957.

*Understanding the Catholic Faith* (official adult edition of the Baltimore Catechism), John O'Brien, Ave Maria Press, Indiana, 1954.

*The Papal Encyclicals*, edited by Anne Freemantle, The New American Library, New York, 1963.

*The Saints : A Concise Biographical Dictionary*, John Coulson, Guild Press, New York, 1958.

*The Confessions*, Saint Augustine, Modern ibrary, Random House New York.

*The City of God*, Saint Augustine, Modern Library, Random House, New York.

*The Holy Rule of Saint Benedict.*

*A History of English Church and People*, Bede, Penguin Books, London, 1955.

*The Pocket Aquinas*, edited and translated by Vernon J. Bourke, Washington Square Press, New York, 1960.

*The Canticles of the Sun*, St. Francis of Assisi.

*Spiritual Exercises*, Ignatius Loyala.

*The Spanish Inquisition*, Henry Kamen, The New American Library, New York, 1965.

*A Nun's Story*, Katherine Hulme, Pocket Books, New York, 1957.

*The Institutes of the Christian Religion*, John Calvin.

*One God : The Ways we Worship Him*, Florence Mary Fitch, Lothrop Lee & Shephard New York, 1944.

**Christian Propaganda Against Islam:**

*Islam and the West*, the Making of an Image: Norman Daniel, the University of Endinburg, 1962.

*Western Views of Islam in the Middle Ages*, S. W. Southern, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1962.

*The Song of Roland*, translated by Dorothy L. Sayers, Penguin Books, London, 1957.

*Poem of the Cid*, translated by W. S. Merwin, New American Library, New York, 1959.

*Childhood in the Moslem World*, Samuel Zwemer, Fleming H. Revell Co., New York, 1915.

*Torch for Islam*, Biography of George K. Harris, Malcolm R. Bradshaw, Mission Press, Cambridge, 1965.

*The Dome and the Rock*, Jerusalem Studies in Islam, Kenneth Cragg, S.P.C.K., London, 1964.

*The Call of the Minaret*, Kenneth Cragg, Oxford University Press. New York, 1956.

**Islamic Polemics Against Christian Dogma :**

*The Gospel of Barnabas*, with a foreword by Lt. Col. M. A. Rahim, Aisha Bawany Waqf, Karachi, 1974.

**Islam :**

*The Meaning of the Glorious Quran*, Muhammad Marmaduke Pickthall, New American Library, New York 1953.

*Ideals and Realities of Islam*, Syed Hossein Nasr, George Allen & Uwin Ltd., London 1966.

*Islamic Faith and Practice*, Mohammad Manzoor Naomani, Academy of Islamic Research and Publications, Lucknow, 1962.

*The Four Pillars of Islam*, Abul Hasan Ali Nadwi, Academy of Islamic Research and Publications, Lucknow, 1972.

*Muhammad : The Ideal Prophet*, Sulaiman Nadwi, Academy of Islamic Research, Lucknow, 1977.

*The Eternal Message of Muhammad*, Abdur Rahman Azzam, Devin-Adair, New York 1965.

*Muhammad : the Benefactor of Humanity*, Naeem Siddiqui, Islamic Publications, Lahore, 1974.

*Saviours of the Islamic Spirit*, Abul Hasan Ali Nadwi, Academy of Islamic Research and Publications, Lusknow, Vol. I, 1971, Vol. II., 1974.

*The Road to Mecca*, Muhammad Asad, Simon & Schuster Inc., New York, 1954.